TRANSACTIONS OF THE
AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY
Volume 00, Number 0, Pages 000–000
S 0002-9947(XX)0000-0

# ROBUST HEDGING OF OPTIONS ON LOCAL TIME

JULIEN CLAISSE, GAOYUE GUO, PIERRE HENRY-LABORDÈRE

arXiv:1511.07230v2 [math.PR] 21 Apr 2016

Abstract. In this paper, we focus on *model-free pricing* and *robust hedging* of options depending on the local time when one or more marginals of the underlying price process are known. By using the stochastic control approach initiated in Galichon, Henry-Labordère and Touzi [15], we identify the optimal hedging strategies and the corresponding prices in the one-marginal case. As a by-product, we recover the property that the Vallois solutions to the Skorokhod embedding problem (SEP) maximize and minimize the expectation of any convex function of the local time. Furthermore, we extend the analysis to the two-marginal case, where we provide candidates for the optimal hedging strategies, and, we construct a new solution to the two-marginal SEP as a generalization of the Vallois embedding. Finally, a special multi-marginal case is studied, where the stopping times given by Vallois are well-ordered. In the $n$-marginal case, we solve the robust hedging problem as it essentially reduces to the one-marginal case. In the full marginal setting, we construct a remarkable Markov martingale and compute its generator explicitly. In particular, this provides a new example of fake Brownian motion.

**Key words:** Skorokhod embedding, Model-free pricing, Robust hedging, Local time

**AMS subject classification.** 60G40, 60G44, 91G20, 91G80

## 1. Introduction

The classical pricing paradigm of contingent claims consists in postulating first a model, *i.e.*, a risk-neutral measure, under which forward prices are required to be martingales according to the no-arbitrage framework. Then the price of any European derivative is obtained as the expectation of its discounted payoff under this measure. Additionally, the model may be required to be calibrated to the market prices of liquid options such as call options that are available for hedging the exotic derivative under consideration. This could lead to a wide range of no-arbitrage prices when evaluated using different models calibrated to the same market data. To account for the model uncertainty, it is natural to consider simultaneously a family of models $\{\mathbb{P}_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}$. When $\mathbb{P}_\alpha$ are mutually singular, *e.g.*, due to different volatilities, the family is non-dominated. The mathematical analysis becomes then challenging, see, *e.g.*, Avellaneda, Levy and Parás [1], Lyons [25] and Denis and Martini [13].

Under the framework of model uncertainty, we do not have a unique price but rather an interval of no-arbitrage prices. Indeed, instead of the perfect replication, the seller (resp. buyer) aims to construct a portfolio to super-replicate (resp. sub-replicate) the derivative under any market scenario by trading dynamically in the underlying assets and statically in a range of Vanilla options. Then the bounds of the no-arbitrage interval are given by the minimal super-replication and the maximal sub-replication prices. The robust hedging problem is to compute these bounds as well as the corresponding trading strategies. For simplicity, we consider the case where all European call options are available for trading for a finite set of maturities. As observed by Breeden and

©XXXX American Mathematical Society

Litzenberger [4], the marginal distributions of the underlying price process are uniquely determined by the market prices.

The robust hedging problem is classically approached by means of the Skorokhod embedding problem (SEP for short), which consists in representing a given probability on the real line as the distribution of a Brownian motion stopped at a chosen stopping time, see, *e.g.*, Oblój [29]. This approach relies on the fact that every continuous martingale can be considered as a time-changed Brownian motion. Thus, for payoffs invariant under time change, the problem can be formulated in terms of finding a solution to the SEP which optimizes the criterion given by the payoff. When all European call options have the same maturity as the exotic derivative, this approach was initiated by Hobson who solved the robust superhedging problem of lookback options in his seminal paper [21]. Importantly, a key step in this paper is to guess the form of the optimal hedging strategies based on the Azéma-Yor embedding. Since then, the SEP has received substantial attention from the mathematical finance community and this approach was subsequently exploited in Brown, Hobson and Rogers [6] for barrier options, in Cox, Hobson and Oblój [10] for options on local time, in Cox and Oblój [11] for double-barrier options and in Cox and Wang [12] for options on variance. A thorough review of the literature is provided in the survey paper by Hobson [19]. More recently, Beiglböck, Cox and Huesmann [3] developed a new approach to SEP inspired from optimal mass transport. They establish a geometric principle, called monotonicity principle, which allows to reinterpret all known optimal embeddings in a systematic manner, and generate further embeddings as a by-product.

Recently, a new approach to study the robust hedging problem was developed by Galichon, Henry-Labordère and Touzi [15]. It is based on a dual representation of the robust hedging problem, which can be addressed by means of the stochastic control theory. It appears that the stochastic control approach is remarkably devised to provide candidates for the optimal hedging strategies. Once postulated, the hedging inequality can be verified independently. Thus, the stochastic control approach comes as a complement to the SEP to study the robust hedging problem. This is illustrated by the study of Henry-Labordère, Oblój, Spoida and Touzi [18], where they solve the robust hedging problem of lookback options when a finite number of marginals are known. To the best of our knowledge, at the exception of Brown, Hobson and Rogers [5] and Hobson and Neuberger [20] who considered the two-marginal case, it is the first paper to address the multi-marginal problem. Importantly, it led to the first (nontrivial) solution of the multi-marginal SEP, which can be seen as a generalization of the Azéma-Yor solution, see Oblój and Spoida [28].

In this paper, we are mainly concerned with the robust hedging problem for options written on the local time of the underlying price process. Financial derivatives on local times appear naturally when considering payoffs depending on the portfolio value of an at-the-money call option delta hedged with its intrinsic value as highlighted by Ito-Tanaka's formula. They can also appear when considering infinitesimal corridor variance swaps which pay the sum of daily squared log-returns conditional to be in an infinitesimal corridor around the spot. For further developments, we refer to Carr [7, 9]. The robust superhedging problem for options on local time has already been studied by Cox, Hobson and Oblój [10] by the SEP approach. Using the Vallois embedding, they provide a good guess for the optimal hedging strategies. As a by-product, they recover the property that the Vallois embedding maximizes the expectation of any convex function of the local time among all solutions of the SEP. By using the stochastic control approach, we reproduce their results for the robust superhedging problem and we derive the corresponding results for the robust subhedging problem when one marginal is known. The last result is new to the literature. Then we aim at extending the study to the two-marginal case, where we provide canditates for the optimal hedging strategies. To this end, we construct a new solution to the two-marginal SEP, which can be seen as a generalisation of the Vallois embedding.

The paper is organized as follows. We briefly introduce in Section 2 the framework of robust hedging of exotic derivatives and its relation with the martingale optimal transport. In Section 3, using the stochastic control approach, we provide explicit formulas for the bounds of the no-arbitrage interval and the optimal hedging strategies when one marginal is known. In Section 4, we proceed by iteration to provide candidates for the optimal hedging strategies in the two-marginal case. Although we are not able to verify the hedging inequality in general, we provide examples where we can complete the proof. Importantly, we also construct a new solution to the two-marginal SEP. Finally, we consider in Section 5 a special multi-marginal setting, where the Vallois embeddings are well-ordered. When finitely many marginals are known, we solve the robust hedging problem as it essentially reduces to the one-marginal case. In the full marginal setting, we construct a remarkable Markov martingale via the family of the Vallois embeddings and compute explicitly its generator. As an application, we provide a new example of fake Brownian motion.

## 2. Robust hedging consistent with Vanillas

2.1. **Modeling the model uncertainty.** We consider a financial market consisting of a risky asset, which may be traded at any time $0 \le t \le T$, where $T$ denotes some fixed maturity. We pursue a robust approach and do not specify the dynamics of the (forward) price. More precisely, given an initial value $X_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, we introduce the set of continuous paths $\Omega := \{\omega \in C([0,T],\mathbb{R}) : \omega(0) = X_0\}$ as the canonical space equipped with the uniform norm $\|\omega\|_\infty := \sup_{0\le t\le T} |\omega(t)|$. Let $X = (X_t)_{0\le t\le T}$ be the canonical process and $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{0\le t\le T}$ be the natural filtration, *i.e.*, $X_t(\omega) := \omega(t)$ and $\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma(X_u, u \le t)$. In this setting, $X$ stands for the price process of the underlying security with initial value $X_0$. In order to account for the model uncertainty, we introduce the set $\mathcal{P}$ of all probability measures $\mathbb{P}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_T)$ such that $X$ is a $\mathbb{P}-$martingale. The restriction to martingale measures is motivated by the classical no-arbitrage framework in mathematical finance. For the sake of generality, we do not restrict to $X_t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ but consider the general case $X_t \in \mathbb{R}$.

In addition, we assume that all European call options with maturities $0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_n = T$ are available for trading. A model $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ is said to be calibrated to the market if $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[(X_{t_i} - K)^+] = c_i(K)$ for every $K \in \mathbb{R}$ and $i = 1, \dots, n$, where $c_i(K)$ denotes the price of a $t_i$-call option with strike $K$. For such a model, it follows by Breeden and Litzenberger [4] that, by direct differentiation with respect to $K$,

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{t_i} > K) \;=\; -c_i'(K+) \;=:\; \mu_i\left((K, +\infty)\right).$$

Hence the marginal distributions of $X_{t_i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ are uniquely specified by the market prices. Let $\boldsymbol{\mu} := (\mu_i)_{1\le i\le n}$ and

$$\mathcal{P}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \;:=\; \Big\{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P} : X_{t_i} \overset{\mathbb{P}}{\sim} \mu_i \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, n\Big\}$$

be the set of calibrated market models. By Kellerer's theorem [24], we have $\mathcal{P}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is a peacock centered at $X_0$ or, equivalently,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |x| d\mu_i(x) < +\infty,\ \int_{\mathbb{R}} x d\mu_i(x) = X_0 \text{ and } i \mapsto c_i(K) \text{ is nondecreasing for all } K \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $c_i(K) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (x-K)^+ d\mu_i(x)$.

2.2. **Semi-static hedging strategies.** We denote by $\mathbb{H}^0$ the collection of all $\mathbb{F}-$predictable processes and, for every $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$,

$$\mathbb{H}^2(\mathbb{P}) \;:=\; \Big\{\Delta = (\Delta_t)_{0\le t\le T} \in \mathbb{H}^0 : \int_0^T |\Delta_t|^2 d\langle X\rangle_t < +\infty,\ \mathbb{P}-\text{a.s.}\Big\}.$$

A dynamic trading strategy is defined by a process $\Delta \in \mathbb{H}^2 := \cap_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}}\mathbb{H}^2(\mathbb{P})$, where $\Delta_t$ corresponds to the number of shares of the underlying asset held by the investor at time $t$. Under the self-financing condition, the portfolio value process of initial wealth $Y_0$ induced by a dynamic trading strategy $\Delta$ is given by

$$Y_t^\Delta \quad := \quad Y_0 + \int_0^t \Delta_s dX_s \quad \text{for all } t \in [0,T],\ \mathbb{P}-\text{a.s. for all } \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}.$$

Notice that both the quadratic variation process and the stochastic integral depend *a priori* on the probability measure under consideration. However, it follows by Nutz [27] that they can be universally defined, *i.e.*, there exist two processes $\langle X\rangle$ and $\int_0^\cdot \Delta_u dX_u$ such that

$$\langle X\rangle_t \ = \ \langle X\rangle_t^{\mathbb{P}} \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^t \Delta_u dX_u \ = \ \Big(\int_0^t \Delta_u dX_u\Big)^{\mathbb{P}} \quad \text{for all t} \in [0,T],\ \mathbb{P}-\text{a.s. for all } \mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}.$$

In addition to the dynamic trading of the underlying security, we assume that the investor can take static positions in call and put options with all possible strikes and maturities $t_1,\dots,t_n$. Consequently, up to integrability, the European derivative defined by the payoff $H_i(X_{t_i})$, which can be statically replicated by $t_i$-call options in view of the celebrated Carr-Madan formula, has an unambiguous market price

$$\mu_i(H_i) \quad := \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} H_i(x)\, d\mu_i(x).$$

The set of Vanilla payoffs which may be used by the trader are naturally taken in the set

$$H^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \quad := \quad \Big\{\boldsymbol{H} = (H_i)_{1\le i\le n} : \mu_i\big(|H_i|\big) < +\infty \text{ for all } i = 1,\dots,n\Big\}.$$

A pair $(\Delta, \boldsymbol{H}) \in \mathbb{H}^2 \times H^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ is called a semi-static hedging strategy, and induces the final value of the self-financing portfolio:

$$Y_T^{\Delta,\boldsymbol{H}} \quad := \quad Y_T^\Delta - \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i(H_i) + \sum_{i=1}^n H_i(X_{t_i}), \quad \mathbb{P}-\text{a.s. for all } \mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P},$$

indicating that the investor has the possibility of buying at initial time any derivative with payoff $H_i(X_{t_i})$ for the price $\mu_i(H_i)$.

2.3. **Robust hedging and martingale optimal transport.** Given a derivative of payoff $\xi$ $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable, we consider the corresponding problem of robust (semi-static) hedging. The investor can trade as discussed in the previous section. However we need to impose a further admissibility condition to rule out doubling strategies. Let $\overline{\mathcal{H}}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ consist of all processes $\Delta \in \mathbb{H}^2$ whose induced portfolio value process $Y^\Delta$ is a $\mathbb{P}-$supermartingale for all $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$. The robust superhedging cost is then defined by

$$U^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\xi) \quad := \quad \inf\Big\{Y_0 : \exists(\Delta,\boldsymbol{H}) \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \times H^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \text{ such that } Y_T^{\Delta,\boldsymbol{H}} \ge \xi,\ \mathbb{P}-\text{a.s. for all } \mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}\Big\}.$$

Similarly, let $\underline{\mathcal{H}}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ consist of all processes $\Delta \in \mathbb{H}^2$ whose induced portfolio value process $Y^\Delta$ is a $\mathbb{P}-$submartingale for all $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$. The robust subhedging cost is then defined by

$$D^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\xi) \quad := \quad \sup\Big\{Y_0 : \exists(\Delta,\boldsymbol{H}) \in \underline{\mathcal{H}}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \times H^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \text{ such that } Y_T^{\Delta,\boldsymbol{H}} \le \xi,\ \mathbb{P}-\text{a.s. for all } \mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}\Big\}.$$

Selling $\xi$ at a price higher than $U^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\xi)$ — or buying it at a price lower than $D^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\xi)$ — the trader could set up a portfolio with a negative initial cost and a non-negative payoff under any market scenario leading to a strong (model-independent) arbitrage opportunity.

By taking the expectation in the hedging inequalities under $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$, we obtain the usual pricing–hedging inequalities:

$$U^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\xi) \;\geq\; \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\xi] \;=:\; P^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\xi) \quad \text{and} \quad D^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\xi) \;\leq\; \inf_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\xi] \;=:\; I^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\xi),$$

where $P^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\xi)$ and $I^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\xi)$ are continuous-time martingale optimal transport problems. Indeed, they consist in maximizing or minimizing the criterion defined by the payoff so as to transport the Dirac measure along the given distributions $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n$ by means of a continuous-time process restricted to be a martingale. The study of martingale optimal transportation was recently initiated by Beiglböck, Henry-Labordère and Penkner [2] in discrete-time and by Galichon, Henry-Labordère and Touzi [15] in continuous-time. By analogy with the classical optimal transportation theory, one expects to establish a sort of Kantorovitch duality and to characterize the optimizers for both the primal and the dual problems. The dual formulation has a natural financial interpretation in terms of robust hedging problem, which explains the increasing interest of the mathematical finance community in martingale optimal transport. When the payoff is invariant under time change, the SEP and the stochastic control approach turn out to be powerful tools to derive the duality and compute explicitly the optimizers, see Galichon, Henry-Labordère and Touzi [15] and Henry-Labordère, Oblój, Spoida and Touzi [18]. For more general payoffs, we refer to the recent studies by Dolinsky and Soner [14], Hou and Oblój [22] and Guo, Tan and Touzi [17].

2.4. **Robust hedging of options on local time.** In this paper, we focus on the robust hedging problem of options whose payoff is given by

$$\xi \;:=\; F(L_T) \text{ with } F : \mathbb{R}_+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

where $L = (L_t)_{0\leq t\leq T}$ is the local time of $X$ at $X_0$. Below, under appropriate conditions, we will exhibit the optimizers for both the robust hedging and the martingale optimal transport problems, and show further that there is no duality gap, that is, $U^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(F(L_T)) = P^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(F(L_T))$ and $D^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(F(L_T)) = I^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(F(L_T))$.

The payoff $F(L_T)$ can be interpreted as a payoff depending on the portfolio value at maturity $T$ of an at-the-money call option delta hedged with its intrinsic value, mathematically expressed by Itô-Tanaka's formula

$$\frac{1}{2}L_T \;=\; (X_T - X_0)^+ - \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\{X_s > X_0\}} dX_s.$$

Notice that, in view of the pathwise construction of stochastic integrals in Nutz [27], the formula above implies that the local time can also be universally defined.

Since the local time is invariant under time change, the martingale optimal transport problem can be formulated as an optimal multiple stopping problem. Indeed, it follows from the Dambis-Dubins-Schwartz theorem that

$$P^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(F(L_T)) \;=\; \sup_{(\tau_i)_{1\leq i\leq n}\in\mathcal{T}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}} \mathbb{E}\left[F(L^B_{\tau_n})\right] \quad \text{and} \quad I^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(F(L_T)) \;=\; \inf_{(\tau_i)_{1\leq i\leq n}\in\mathcal{T}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}} \mathbb{E}\left[F(L^B_{\tau_n})\right], \tag{2.1}$$

where $(L^B_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is the local time at zero of a Brownian motion $(B_t)_{t\geq 0}$ and $\mathcal{T}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ is the set of ordered stopping times $\tau_1 \leq \cdots \leq \tau_n < +\infty$ with $B_{\tau_i} \sim \mu_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ and $B^{\tau_n} := (B_{t\wedge\tau^n})_{t\geq 0}$ uniformly integrable. See Galichon, Henry-Labordère and Touzi [15] and Guo, Tan and Touzi [16] for more details. Here, the formulation (2.1) is directly searching for a solution to the multi-marginal SEP which maximizes or minimizes the criterion defined by the payoff.

In the one-marginal case ($n = 1$), if $F$ is a convex function, the optimal solutions are of the form

$$\tau \;:=\; \inf\left\{t > 0 :\; B_t \notin (\phi_-(L^B_t), \phi_+(L^B_t))\right\},$$

for some monotone functions $\phi_+$ and $\phi_-$. This result was first obtained by Vallois [34], where he gives explicit constructions for the functions $\phi_+$ and $\phi_-$. More recently, it was derived by Beiglböck, Cox and Huesmann [3] as a consequence of their monotonicity principle. However, the explicit computation of $(\phi_+, \phi_-)$ is not provided by their approach. Note also that it is restricted to the one-marginal case.

In the rest of paper, we take $X_0 = 0$ without loss of generality and we make the following assumption on the function $F$.

*Assumption* 2.1. $F : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ is a Lipschitz convex function.

## 3. One-marginal case

We start by considering the one-marginal case ($n = 1$). Using the stochastic control approach, we reproduce the results for the robust superhedging problem — optimizers and duality — obtained in Cox, Hobson and Oblój [10] and Vallois [34]. In addition, we provide the corresponding results for the robust subhedging problem. Throughout this section, we work under the following assumption on the marginal $\mu$.

*Assumption* 3.1. $\mu$ is a centered probability distribution without mass at zero.

### 3.1. Robust superhedging problem.

In this section, under Assumptions 2.1 and 3.1, we provide the optimal semi-static strategy for $U^\mu(F(L_T))$ as well as the optimal measure for $P^\mu(F(L_T))$ and we show that there is no duality gap, *i.e.*, $P^\mu(F(L_T)) = U^\mu(F(L_T))$. The key idea is that for any suitable pair of monotone functions $(\phi_+, \phi_-)$, we may construct a super-replication strategy $(\Delta, H) = (\Delta^{\phi_\pm}, H^{\phi_\pm})$. The optimality then results from taking the pair of functions given by Vallois that embeds the probability distribution $\mu$.

*Assumption* 3.2. $\phi_+ : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ (resp. $\phi_- : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_-$) is right-continuous and nondecreasing (resp. nonincreasing) such that $\gamma(0+) = 0$ and $\gamma(+\infty) = +\infty$ where

$$\gamma(l) \quad := \quad \frac{1}{2}\int_0^l \left(\frac{1}{\phi_+(m)} - \frac{1}{\phi_-(m)}\right) dm \quad \text{for all } l > 0.$$

Under Assumption 3.2, we define the static strategy $H : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ via $(\phi_+, \phi_-)$ by

$$H'(\pm x) := H'(0\pm) + \int_0^{\psi_\pm(\pm x)} \frac{dy}{\phi_\pm(y)} e^{\gamma(y)} \int_y^{+\infty} e^{-\gamma(m)} F''(dm) \quad \text{for all } x > 0, \tag{3.1}$$

$$H'(0\pm) := \pm F'(0) \pm \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\gamma(m)} F''(dm), \tag{3.2}$$

$$H(0) := F(0). \tag{3.3}$$

where $\psi_\pm$ denote the right-continuous inverses of $\phi_\pm$, $F'$ is the right derivative of $F$ and $F''(dm)$ is the second derivative of $F$ in the sense of distributions. Notice that $F'$ is uniformly bounded and the restriction of $H$ on $\mathbb{R}_+$ and $\mathbb{R}_-$ is convex.

*Remark* 3.3. The derivation of $H$ is performed in Section 3.3 by means of the stochastic control approach. Here the choice $H(0) = F(0)$ is completely arbitrary by definition of the problem and it turns out from the computation that only the value of $H'(0+) - H'(0-)$ matters.

3.1.1. *Pathwise inequality.* We start by showing a remarkable pathwise inequality, which is a key step in our analysis. Indeed, together with the Vallois embedding, it leads to the solution of the robust superhedging problem.

**Proposition 3.4** (Robust super-replication)**.** *Under Assumptions 2.1 and 3.2, the following inequality holds*

$$\int_0^T \Delta_u dX_u + H(X_T) \quad \geq \quad F(L_T), \quad \mathbb{P}-a.s.\ for\ all\ \mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}, \tag{3.4}$$

*where the function $H$ is defined by* (3.1), (3.2), (3.3) *and the process $\Delta$ is given by*

$$\Delta_u \quad := \quad -A_+(L_u)\mathbf{1}_{\{X_u>0\}} - A_-(L_u)\mathbf{1}_{\{X_u\leq 0\}}, \tag{3.5}$$

*with $A_\pm : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ given by*

$$A_\pm(l) \quad := \quad H'(0\pm) + \int_0^l \frac{dy}{\phi_\pm(y)} e^{\gamma(y)} \int_y^{+\infty} e^{-\gamma(m)} F''(dm). \tag{3.6}$$

Proposition 3.4 implies that, in order to construct a super-replication, it suffices to consider a pair $(\phi_+, \phi_-)$ satisfying Assumption 3.2. The duality and the optimality will follow once we find an optimal pair as it will be shown in the next section.

*Remark* 3.5. A slightly different pathwise inequality is derived in Appendix A. Notice also that $H'$ coincides with $A_+ \circ \psi_+$ (resp. $A_- \circ \psi_-$) on $\mathbb{R}_+$ (resp. $\mathbb{R}-$) by definition and thus $A_\pm = H' \circ \phi_\pm$ if $\phi_\pm$ are strictly monotone or, equivalently, $\psi_\pm$ are continuous.

Before giving the proof of Proposition 3.4, we show that the pathwise inequality yields an upper bound for $U^\mu(F(L_T))$.

**Corollary 3.6.** *Under Assumptions 2.1 and 3.2, one has for any centered probability measure $\mu$,*

$$P^\mu(F(L_T)) \ \leq \ U^\mu(F(L_T)) \ \leq \ \mu(H).$$

*Proof.* In view of (2.1), it suffices to prove that $U^\mu(F(L_T)) \leq \mu(H)$. This result follows immediately from Proposition 3.4 providing that $H \in H^\mu$ and $\Delta \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}^\mu$. The former is a straightforward consequence of the boundedness of $H'$ which is proved in Lemma 3.7 below. Let us show now that $\Delta \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}^\mu$. Since $\Delta$ is bounded, it clearly belongs to $\mathbb{H}^2$ and thus $\int_0^\cdot \Delta_u dX_u$ is a local martingale under any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}^\mu$. Further, the pathwise inequality (3.4) implies that for all $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}^\mu$,

$$\int_0^t \Delta_u dX_u \ \geq \ F(L_t) - H(X_t) \ \geq \ -C(L_t + |X_t|) \quad \text{for all } t \in [0,T],\ \mathbb{P}-\text{a.s.}$$

where $C := \|F'\|_\infty \vee \|H'\|_\infty$ and $\|\ \|_\infty$ denotes the supremum norm. The conclusion results from the fact that a local martingale bounded from below by a nonpositive supermartingale is a supermartingale by Fatou's Lemma. □

The rest of the section is devoted to the proof of Proposition 3.4. We start by establishing in the following lemma some technical results regarding the functions $H$ and $A_\pm$.

**Lemma 3.7.** *With the notations of Proposition 3.4, it holds for all $l > 0$,*

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(A_+(l) - A_-(l)\right) \quad = \quad F'(l) + e^{\gamma(l)} \int_l^{+\infty} e^{-\gamma(m)} F''(dm), \tag{3.7}$$

$$H(\phi_+(l)) - A_+(l)\phi_+(l) \quad = \quad H(\phi_-(l)) - A_-(l)\phi_-(l). \tag{3.8}$$

*In addition, the functions $A_\pm$ are uniformly bounded on $\mathbb{R}_+$.*

*Proof.* The first identity results easily from applying Fubini-Tonelli's theorem in the following relation:

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(A_+(l) - A_-(l)\right) \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\left(H'(0+) - H'(0-)\right) + \int_0^l \gamma'(z) e^{\gamma(z)} \int_z^{+\infty} e^{-\gamma(m)} F''(dm) dz.$$

Further, we have

$$H'(0+) \;\le\; A_+(l) \;\le\; A_+(l) + H'(0-) - A_-(l).$$

Using the relation (3.7), we deduce that $|A_+(l)| \le |H'(0+)| + 2\|F'\|_\infty$. Repeating the same arguments, we can also show that $|A_-(l)| \le |H'(0-)| + 2\|F'\|_\infty$. Let us turn now to the identity (3.8). By change of variable, we get

$$H(\phi_+(l)) - H(0) \;=\; \int_{[0,l]} A_+(m)\, \phi'_+(dm),$$

where $\phi'_+$ denotes the first derivative of $\phi_+$ in the sense of distributions. By integration by parts, we obtain

$$H(\phi_+(l)) - A_+(l)\phi_+(l) \;=\; H(0) - \int_0^l e^{\gamma(z)} \int_z^{+\infty} e^{-\gamma(m)} F''(dm) dz. \tag{3.9}$$

Repeating the same arguments, we can show that $H(\phi_-(l)) - A_-(l)\phi_-(l)$ coincides with the r.h.s. above, which ends the proof. □

*Proof of Proposition 3.4.* Let $u : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ be given by

$$u(x,l) \;:=\; -A_+(l)x^+ + A_-(l)x^- + A_+(l)\phi_+(l) - H(\phi_+(l)) + F(l).$$

We notice first that

$$\lim_{x \uparrow \phi_\pm(l)} H'(x) \;\le\; A_\pm(l) \;\le\; \lim_{x \downarrow \phi_\pm(l)} H'(x).$$

Using the convexity of $H$ and the relation (3.8), we deduce that $u(x,l) \ge F(l) - H(x)$. Let us prove now that

$$u\left(X_T, L_T\right) \;=\; \int_0^T \Delta_u dX_u,$$

which clearly yields the required inequality. Using successively Itô-Tanaka's formula and the relation (3.7), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} -A_+(L_T)X_T^+ + A_-(L_t)X_T^- &\\ &= \int_0^T \Delta_u dX_u - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{L_T} \left(A_+(l) - A_-(l)\right) dl \\ &= \int_0^T \Delta_u dX_u - F(L_T) + F(0) - \int_0^{L_T} e^{\gamma(l)} \int_l^{+\infty} e^{-\gamma(m)} F''(dm) dl. \end{aligned}$$

We deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} u(X_T, L_T) = \int_0^T \Delta_u dX_u + A_+(L_T)\phi_+(L_T) - H(\phi_+(L_T)) &\\ + F(0) - \int_0^{L_T} e^{\gamma(l)} \int_l^{+\infty} e^{-\gamma(m)} F''(dm) dl. & \end{aligned}$$

The conclusion follows immediately by using the identity (3.9). □

*Remark* 3.8. We refer to Section 3.3 for a comprehensive presentation of the arguments that led us to consider the function $u$ in the proof of Proposition 3.4.

3.1.2. *Optimality and duality.* In view of Corollary 3.6, the duality is achieved once we find a suitable pair $(\phi_+^\mu, \phi_-^\mu)$ such that the corresponding static strategy $H^\mu$ satisfies $\mu(H^\mu) = P^\mu(F(L_T))$. In this section, we use the Vallois solution to the SEP to construct such a pair and to provide optimizers for both $U^\mu(F(L_T))$ and $P^\mu(F(L_T))$.

We recall that $(B_t)_{t\geq 0}$ and $(L_t^B)_{t\geq 0}$ denote a Brownian motion and its local time at zero. Under Assumption 3.1, there exists a pair $(\phi_+^\mu, \phi_-^\mu)$ satisfying Assumption 3.2 such that $B^{\tau^\mu} = (B_{t\wedge\tau^\mu})_{t\geq 0}$ is uniformly integrable and $B_{\tau^\mu} \sim \mu$, where

$$\tau^\mu \quad := \quad \inf\left\{t > 0 : \ B_t \notin (\phi_-^\mu(L_t^B), \phi_+^\mu(L_t^B))\right\}.$$

We refer to Vallois [33] and Cox, Hobson and Oblój [10] for a proof.

*Remark* 3.9. If $\mu$ admits a positive density $\mu(x)$ w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure, it holds

$$\phi_\pm^{\mu\,\prime}(l) \quad = \quad \frac{1 - \mu\left([\phi_-^\mu(l), \phi_+^\mu(l)]\right)}{2\phi_\pm^\mu(l)\mu(\phi_\pm^\mu(l))}, \quad \text{for all } l > 0.$$

If we assume further that $\mu$ is symmetric, then $\phi_\pm^\mu = \pm\phi^\mu$ and

$$\psi^\mu(x) \quad = \quad \int_0^x \frac{y\mu(y)}{\mu\left([y, +\infty)\right)} dy, \quad \text{for all } x \geq 0$$

where $\psi^\mu$ denotes the inverse of $\phi^\mu$.

The following theorem, which is the main result of this section, shows that the pair given by Vallois yields the duality and the optimizers for both $U^\mu(F(L_T))$ and $P^\mu(F(L_T))$.

**Theorem 3.10.** *Under Assumptions 2.1 and 3.1, there is no duality gap, i.e.,*

$$P^\mu(F(L_T)) \ = \ U^\mu(F(L_T)) \ = \ \mu(H^\mu),$$

*where $H^\mu$ is constructed by* (3.1), (3.2) *and* (3.3) *from $(\phi_+^\mu, \phi_-^\mu)$. In addition, there exists an optimizer $\mathbb{P}^\mu$ for $P^\mu(F(L_T))$ such that*

$$\int_0^T \Delta_u^\mu dX_u + H^\mu(X_T) \quad = \quad F(L_T), \quad \mathbb{P}^\mu - a.s., \tag{3.10}$$

*where the process $\Delta^\mu$ is given by* (3.5) *with $(\phi_+^\mu, \phi_-^\mu)$.*

*Proof.* Denote by $\mathbb{P}^\mu$ the law of the process $Z = (Z_t)_{0\leq t\leq T}$ given by

$$Z_t \quad := \quad B_{\tau^\mu \wedge \frac{t}{T-t}} \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T].$$

Since $Z$ is a continuous martingale w.r.t. its natural filtration such that $Z_T \sim \mu$, $\mathbb{P}^\mu$ clearly belongs to $\mathcal{P}^\mu$. Let us turn first to the proof of (3.10). Define $u^\mu : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$u^\mu(x, l) \quad := \quad -A_+^\mu(l)x^+ + A_-^\mu(l)x^- + A_+^\mu(l)\phi_+^\mu(l) - H^\mu(\phi_+^\mu(l)) + F(l).$$

where $A_\pm^\mu$ is given by (3.6) with $(\phi_+^\mu, \phi_-^\mu)$. Since the local time is invariant under time change, we have $X_T = \phi_\pm^\mu(L_T)$ almost surely under $\mathbb{P}^\mu$. Thus, it clearly holds

$$u^\mu(X_T, L_T) \quad = \quad F(L_T) - H(X_T), \quad \mathbb{P}^\mu - \text{a.s.}$$

By repeating the arguments of Proposition 3.4, we obtain

$$\int_0^T \Delta_u^\mu dX_u + H^\mu(X_T) \quad = \quad F(L_T), \quad \mathbb{P}^\mu - \text{a.s.}$$

To conclude, it remains to show that $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^\mu}[F(L_T)] = \mu(H^\mu)$. This will be achieved in Lemma 3.11 below by proving that

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^\mu}\left[\int_0^T \Delta_u^\mu dX_u\right] \quad = \quad 0.$$

□

**Lemma 3.11.** *With the notations of Theorem 3.10, one has*

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^\mu}\left[\int_0^T \Delta_u^\mu dX_u\right] \quad = \quad 0.$$

*Proof.* This proof is an extension of Lemma 2.1 in Cox, Hobson and Oblój [10]. It relies on similar arguments, which we repeat here for the sake of completeness. First, we notice that the desired result is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^{\tau^\mu} \left(A_+^\mu(L_s^B)\mathbf{1}_{\{B_s>0\}} + A_-^\mu(L_s^B)\mathbf{1}_{\{B_s\leq 0\}}\right) dB_s\right] \quad = \quad 0,$$

since the local time is invariant under time change. For the sake of clarity, we omit the index $\mu$ in the notations and we denote $L$ instead of $L^B$ in the rest of the proof. Let $\sigma_n := \inf\{t \geq 0 : |B_t| \geq n\}$, $\rho_m := \inf\{t \geq 0 : L_t \geq m\}$ and $\tau_{n,m} := \tau \wedge \sigma_n \wedge \rho_m$. Denote

$$M_t \quad := \quad \int_0^t \left(A_+(L_s)\mathbf{1}_{\{B_s>0\}} + A_-(L_s)\mathbf{1}_{\{B_s\leq 0\}}\right) dB_s, \qquad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

From Itô-Tanaka's formula, it follows that

$$M_t \quad = \quad A_+(L_t)B_t^+ - A_-(L_t)B_t^- - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t \left(A_+(L_s) - A_-(L_s)\right) dL_s.$$

We deduce that the stopped local martingale $M^{\tau_{m,n}}$ is bounded. Hence, it is a uniformly integrable martingale and we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{2}\int_0^{\tau_{n,m}} \left(A_+(L_s) - A_-(L_s)\right) dL_s\right] \\
&\qquad = \ \mathbb{E}\left[A_+(L_{\tau_{n,m}})B^+_{\tau_{n,m}} - A_-(L_{\tau_{n,m}})B^-_{\tau_{n,m}}\right] \\
&\qquad = \ \mathbb{E}\left[\left(A_+(L_{\tau_{n,\infty}})B^+_{\tau_{n,\infty}} - A_-(L_{\tau_{n,\infty}})B^-_{\tau_{n,\infty}}\right)\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau\wedge\sigma_n\leq\rho_m\}}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{2}\int_0^{\tau_{n,m}} \left(\left(A_+(L_s) - H'(0+)\right) - \left(A_-(L_s) - H'(0-)\right)\right) dL_s\right] \\
&\qquad = \ \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\left(A_+(L_{\tau_{n,\infty}}) - H'(0+)\right)B^+_{\tau_{n,\infty}} - \left(A_-(L_{\tau_{n,\infty}}) - H'(0-)\right)B^-_{\tau_{n,\infty}}\right)\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau\wedge\sigma_n\leq\rho_m\}}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

By the monotone convergence theorem, as $m$ tends to infinity, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{2}\int_0^{\tau_{n,\infty}} \left(\left(A_+(L_s) - H'(0+)\right) - \left(A_-(L_s) - H'(0-)\right)\right) dL_s\right] \\
&\qquad = \ \mathbb{E}\left[\left(A_+(L_{\tau_{n,\infty}}) - H'(0+)\right)B^+_{\tau_{n,\infty}} - \left(A_-(L_{\tau_{n,\infty}}) - H'(0-)\right)B^-_{\tau_{n,\infty}}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Then, as $n$ tends to infinity, the l.h.s. converges, again by the monotone convergence theorem, to

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{2}\int_0^{\tau} \left(\left(A_+(L_s) - H'(0+)\right) - \left(A_-(L_s) - H'(0-)\right)\right) dL_s\right].$$

As for the r.h.s., it converges to

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(A_+(L_\tau) - H'(0+)\right)B_\tau^+ - \left(A_-(L_\tau) - H'(0-)\right)B_\tau^-\right] \quad < \quad +\infty,$$

since $H'$ is bounded and $(B^+_{t\wedge\tau})_{t\geq 0}$ and $(B^-_{t\wedge\tau})_{t\geq 0}$ are uniformly integrable. Hence, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{2}\int_0^\tau \left(A_+(L_s) - A_-(L_s)\right) dL_s\right] \quad = \quad \mathbb{E}\left[A_+(L_\tau)B_\tau^+ - A_-(L_\tau)B_\tau^-\right],$$

where both sides are finite. This ends the proof. □

3.2. **Robust subhedging problem.** In this section, we address the robust subhedging problem. In contrast with the results on the superhedging problem which are contained in Cox, Hobson and Oblój [10], the results of this section are new to the literature. We proceed along the lines of Section 3.1, but we reverse the monotonicity assumption on the functions $\phi_+$ and $\phi_-$.

*Assumption* 3.12. $\phi_+ : \mathbb{R}_+^* \to \mathbb{R}_+^*$ (resp. $\phi_- : \mathbb{R}_+^* \to \mathbb{R}_-^*$) is right-continuous and nonincreasing (resp. nondecreasing).

Under Assumption 3.2, we define the static strategy $H : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ via $(\phi_+, \phi_-)$ by

$$H'(\pm x) \quad := \quad H'(0\pm) - \int_{\psi_\pm(\pm x)}^{+\infty} \frac{dy}{\phi_\pm(y)} e^{\gamma(y)} \int_y^{+\infty} e^{-\gamma(m)} F''(dm) \quad \text{for all } x > 0, \tag{3.11}$$

$$H'(0\pm) \quad := \quad \pm F'(+\infty), \tag{3.12}$$

$$H(0) \quad := \quad F(0) - \int_0^{+\infty} e^{\gamma(z)} \int_z^{+\infty} e^{-\gamma(m)} F''(dm) dz, \tag{3.13}$$

where $\psi_\pm$ denote the right-continuous inverses of $\phi_\pm$, $F'$ is the right derivative of $F$, $F''(dm)$ is the second derivative of $F$ in the sense of distributions and

$$\gamma(l) \quad := \quad \frac{1}{2}\int_0^l \left(\frac{1}{\phi_+(m)} - \frac{1}{\phi_-(m)}\right) dm \quad \text{for all } l > 0.$$

Notice that the restriction of $H$ on $\mathbb{R}_+$ and $\mathbb{R}_-$ is now concave.

3.2.1. *Pathwise inequality.* We start by showing the pathwise inequality corresponding to the subhedging problem. Together with the second solution provided by Vallois to the SEP, it leads to the solution of the robust subhedging problem.

**Proposition 3.13** (Robust sub-replication)**.** *Under Assumptions 2.1 and 3.12, the following inequality holds*

$$\int_0^T \Delta_u dX_u + H(X_T) \quad \leq \quad F(L_T), \quad \mathbb{P} - a.s. \text{ for all } \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}, \tag{3.14}$$

*where the function $H$ is defined by* (3.11), (3.12), (3.13) *and the process $\Delta = (\Delta_u)_{0\leq u\leq T}$ is given by*

$$\Delta_u \quad := \quad -A_+(L_u)\mathbf{1}_{\{X_u>0\}} - A_-(L_u)\mathbf{1}_{\{X_u\leq 0\}}, \tag{3.15}$$

*with $A_\pm : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ given by*

$$A_\pm(l) \quad := \quad H'(0\pm) - \int_l^{+\infty} \frac{dy}{\phi_\pm(y)} e^{\gamma(y)} \int_y^{+\infty} e^{-\gamma(m)} F''(dm). \tag{3.16}$$

**Corollary 3.14.** *Under Assumptions 2.1 and 3.12, one has for any centered probability measure $\mu$,*

$$I^\mu(F(L_T)) \;\geq\; D^\mu(F(L_T)) \;\geq\; \mu(H).$$

The proof of Corollary 3.14 is identical to the proof of Corollary 3.6. However, the proof of the pathwise inequality (3.14) is not completely straightforward and thus we provide some details below.

*Proof of Proposition 3.13.* Let us show first that once again we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\left(A_+(l) - A_-(l)\right) &= F'(l) + e^{\gamma(l)} \int_l^{+\infty} e^{-\gamma(m)} F''(dm), \\ H(\phi_+(l)) - A_+(l)\phi_+(l) &= H(\phi_-(l)) - A_-(l)\phi_-(l). \end{aligned}$$

The first identity follows from the same arguments as in the proof of Lemma 3.7. As for the second one, by change of variable and integration by parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H(\phi_+(+\infty)) - H(\phi_+(l)) &= \int_{(l,+\infty)} A_+(m)\phi'_+(dm) \\ &= A_+(+\infty)\phi_+(+\infty) - A_+(l)\phi_+(l) \\ &\qquad - \int_l^{+\infty} e^{\gamma(y)} \int_y^{+\infty} e^{-\gamma(m)} F''(dm)\, dy. \end{aligned}$$

Further, by the definition of $H$, we have $H(\phi_+(+\infty)) - H(0) = H'(0+)\phi_+(+\infty) = A_+(+\infty)\phi_+(+\infty)$. Hence, we obtain

$$H(\phi_+(l)) - A_+(l)\phi_+(l) = F(0) - \int_0^l e^{\gamma(y)} \int_y^{+\infty} e^{-\gamma(m)} F''(dm)\, dy.$$

Similarly, we can show that $H(\phi_-(l)) - A_-(l)\phi_-(l)$ coincides with the r.h.s. above. The rest of the proof follows by repeating the arguments of Proposition 3.4. □

3.2.2. *Optimality and duality.* Using another solution to the SEP provided by Vallois, we derive the duality and provide optimizers for both $D^\mu(F(L_T))$ and $I^\mu(F(L_T))$.

Under Assumption 3.1, there exists a pair $(\phi^\mu_+, \phi^\mu_-)$ satisfying Assumption 3.12 such that $B^{\tau^\mu} = (B_{t\wedge\tau^\mu})_{t\geq 0}$ is uniformly integrable and $B_{\tau^\mu} \sim \mu$, where

$$\tau^\mu := \inf\left\{t > 0 :\ B_t \notin (\phi^\mu_-(L^B_t), \phi^\mu_+(L^B_t))\right\}.$$

We refer to Vallois [34] for a proof.

**Theorem 3.15.** *Under Assumptions 2.1 and 3.1, there is no duality gap, i.e.,*

$$I^\mu(F(L_T)) = D^\mu(F(L_T)) = \mu(H^\mu),$$

*where $H^\mu$ is constructed by* (3.11), (3.12) *and* (3.13) *from $(\phi^\mu_+, \phi^\mu_-)$. In addition, there exists an optimizer $\mathbb{P}^\mu$ for $I^\mu(F(L_T))$ such that*

$$\int_0^T \Delta^\mu_u\, dX_u + H^\mu(X_T) = F(L_T), \quad \mathbb{P}^\mu - a.s.,$$

*where the process $\Delta^\mu$ is given by* (3.15) *with $(\phi^\mu_+, \phi^\mu_-)$.*

The proof of this result is identical to the proof of Theorem 3.10.

*Remark* 3.16. The assumption that $\mu$ has no mass at zero can be dropped in Theorem 3.15. In this setting, the embedding functions given by Vallois can reach zero and we need to modify slightly the definitions of $A_\pm$ and $H$ by replacing the upperbound $+\infty$ in the integral term by $\psi_+(0)$.

3.3. **On the stochastic control approach.** As already mentioned, the results of Section 3.1 can be found in Cox, Hobson and Oblój [10]. The actual novelty here comes from our approach which is based on the stochastic control theory. In this section, we give some insights on the arguments that led us to consider the pathwise inequality (3.4).

Inspired by Galichon, Henry-Labordère and Touzi [15], we consider the following relaxed super-hedging problem:

$$\bar{U}^{\mu} \quad := \quad \inf\left\{Y_0 : \exists\, (\Delta, H) \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}_S \times L^{\infty} \text{ such that } Y_T^{\Delta,H} \geq F(L_T),\ \mathbb{P}-\text{a.s. for all } \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_S\right\},$$

where $\mathcal{P}_S$ is the subset of $\mathcal{P}$ consisting of probability measures

$$\mathbb{P} \ := \ \mathbb{P}_0 \circ (X^{\sigma})^{-1} \text{ with } X^{\sigma} \ := \ \int_0^{\cdot} \sigma_s dX_s \text{ for some } \sigma \in \mathbb{H}^2(\mathbb{P}_0) \text{ such that } \sigma^2 > 0.$$

Here, $\mathbb{P}_0$ is the Wiener measure and $\overline{\mathcal{H}}_S$ is the collection of $\Delta \in \mathbb{H}^2$ such that $Y^{\Delta}$ is a $\mathbb{P}$–supermartingale for all $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_S$. Under the assumption that $F$ is bounded, a dual formulation of this problem is derived in Possamaï, Royer and Touzi [31] so that

$$\bar{U}^{\mu} \quad = \quad \inf_{H \in L^{\infty}} \sup_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_S} \left\{\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[F(L_T) - H(X_T)\right] + \mu(H)\right\}.$$

The Dambis-Dubins-Schwarz theorem implies further that

$$\bar{U}^{\mu} \quad = \quad \inf_{H \in L^{\infty}} \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \left\{\mu(H) + \mathbb{E}\left[F(L_{\tau}^B) - H(B_{\tau})\right]\right\},$$

where $\mathcal{T}$ is the collection of stopping times $\tau$ such that $B^{\tau}$ is a uniformly integrable martingale. For every $H \in L^{\infty}$, we consider the optimal stopping problem

$$u(x,l) := \sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E}_{x,l}\left[F(L_{\tau}^B) - H(B_{\tau})\right],$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{x,l}$ denotes the conditional expectation operator $\mathbb{E}\left[\cdot | B_0 = x, L_0^B = l\right]$.

Using the formal representation $dL_t^B = \delta(B_t)dt$, the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB for short) equation corresponding to this optimal stopping problem reads formally as

$$\max\left(F - H - v,\ \frac{1}{2}\partial_{xx} v + \delta(x)\partial_l v\right) \quad = \quad 0. \tag{3.17}$$

We look for a solution of the form

$$v^{\phi_{\pm}}(x,l) \quad = \quad \begin{cases} a(l)x^+ + b(l)x + c(l), & \text{if } (x,l) \in \mathcal{D}, \\ F(l) - H(x), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\mathcal{D} := \{(x,l);\ x \in (\phi_-(l), \phi_+(l))\}$ with $(\phi_+, \phi_-)$ satisfying Assumption 3.2. For the sake of simplicity, we assume that all the functions are smooth enough to allow the calculation sketched below. Differentiating twice w.r.t. to $x$ creates a delta function $\delta(x)$ which cancels out the delta function appearing in the term $\delta(x)\partial_l v^{\phi_{\pm}}$ providing that $a = -2c'$. Then we impose the continuity and the smooth fit conditions at the boundary $\partial\mathcal{D}$, *i.e.*,

$$\begin{aligned} v^{\phi_{\pm}}(\phi_{\pm}(l), l) \quad &= \quad F(l) - H(\phi_{\pm}(l)), \\ \partial_x v^{\phi_{\pm}}(\phi_{\pm}(l), l) \quad &= \quad -H'(\phi_{\pm}(l)). \end{aligned}$$

We deduce that for all $(x,l) \in \mathcal{D}$,

$$v^{\phi_{\pm}}(x,l) \quad = \quad -H'(\phi_+(l))x^+ + H'(\phi_-(l))x^- + H'(\phi_+(l))\phi_+(l) - H(\phi_+(l)) + F(l).$$

In addition, the function $H$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} H'(\phi_+)\phi_+ - H(\phi_+) &= H'(\phi_-)\phi_- - H(\phi_-), \\ \frac{1}{2}\big(H'(\phi_+) - H'(\phi_-)\big) &= F' + H''(\phi_+)\phi_+'\phi_+. \end{aligned}$$

Under the assumption that $\phi_\pm$ are strictly monotone, these two equations characterize the function $H$ as in (3.1) and impose that

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(H'(0+) - H'(0-)\right) = F'(0) + \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\gamma(m)} F''(dm).$$

Provided that $F$ is convex, $H$ is also convex on $\mathbb{R}_+$ and $\mathbb{R}_-$. It follows that $v^{\phi_\pm}$ satisfies the PDE (3.17) in the distribution sense. Notice that another solution of (3.17) is given by

$$u^{\phi_\pm}(x,l) := -H'(\phi_+(l))x^+ + H'(\phi_-(l))x^- + H'(\phi_+(l))\phi_+(l) - H(\phi_+(l)) + F(l).$$

Then, given any supersolution $v$ of the variational PDE (3.17), it is straightforward to derive heuristically a pathwise inequality. Indeed, using the formal representation $dL_t^B = \delta(B_t)dt$, Itô's formula yields

$$F(L_t^B) - H(B_t) \le v\left(B_t, L_t^B\right) \le \int_0^t \partial_x v\left(B_u, L_u^B\right) dB_u \quad \text{for all } t \ge 0.$$

In particular, if $v$ coincides with $u^{\phi_\pm}$ or $v^{\phi_\pm}$, we recover the pathwise inequality (3.4) with $\Delta$ given by (3.5) and (A.1) respectively. Further, if we take

$$\tau := \inf\left\{t \ge 0 : \ B_t \notin (\phi_-(L_t^B), \phi_+(L_t^B))\right\},$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F(L_\tau^B) - H(B_\tau) &= u^{\phi_\pm}(B_\tau, L_\tau^B) = v^{\phi_\pm}(B_\tau, L_\tau^B) \\ &= -\int_0^\tau \left(H'\left(\phi_+\left(L_u^B\right)\right)\mathbf{1}_{\{B_u>0\}} + H'\left(\phi_-\left(L_u^B\right)\right)\mathbf{1}_{\{B_u\le 0\}}\right) dB_u. \end{aligned}$$

This identity yields the optimality by taking $\phi_\pm = \phi_\pm^\mu$.

3.4. **A special case: Ocone martingales.** In practice, the practitioners have a belief on the dynamic of Vanillas. For instance, they may expect that the price $X_T$ is symmetric around the spot $X_t$ for any future date $t \in (0,T)$. In particular, this is true if the process $X$ is a (continuous) Ocone martingale, *i.e.*, $X_t = B_{\langle X\rangle_t}$ where $B$ is a Brownian motion independent of $\langle X\rangle$.

For any symmetric distribution $\mu$ satisfying Assumption 3.1, we introduce the set $\mathcal{O}^\mu \subset \mathcal{P}^\mu$ of all probability measures $\mathbb{P}$ such that $X$ is an Ocone martingale and $X_T \overset{\mathbb{P}}{\sim} \mu$. Then it follows by the Skorokhod lemma that

$$L_T = \sup_{0\le t\le T} -\int_0^t \operatorname{sgn}(X_s)dX_s.$$

Further, the process $-\int_0^\cdot \operatorname{sgn}(X_s)dX_s$ is identical in law to $X$ by the definition of Ocone martingales, see Ocone [30]. It follows by the reflection principle that

$$L_T \overset{\mathbb{P}}{\sim} \sup_{0\le t\le T} X_t \overset{\mathbb{P}}{\sim} |X_T|, \quad \text{for all } \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{O}^\mu.$$

Hence, one has for every $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{O}^\mu$,

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[F(L_T)] = 2\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} F(x)d\mu(x).$$

This shows that, by adding a belief on the dynamic of Vanillas, the interval of no-arbitrage prices $[I^\mu(F(L_T)), P^\mu(F(L_T))]$ can be tightened. In the present case, it is reduced to a singleton. The

duality and the determination of robust semi-static replication strategies are left for further research.

## 4. Two-marginal case

Using the stochastic control approach, we aim at extending the analysis of Section 3 to the two-marginal case. Although we are not able to solve completely the robust hedging problem in this setting, we give candidates for the optimal semi-static strategy and we provide a new solution to the two-marginal SEP as an extension of the Vallois solution. In the sequel, we consider only the robust superhedging problem for the sake of simplicity but the arguments can be easily adapted to the subhedging problem.

### 4.1. Two-marginal SEP.

In this section, we provide a new solution to the two-marginal SEP as an extension of the Vallois embedding. Namely, given $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \mu_2)$ a centered peacock, we want to construct a pair of stopping rules based on the local time such that $\tau_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \leq \tau_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$, $B_{\tau_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}} \sim \mu_1$, $B_{\tau_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}} \sim \mu_2$ and $B^{\tau_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}$ is uniformly integrable. A natural idea is to take the Vallois embeddings corresponding to $\mu_1$ and $\mu_2$. However these stopping times are not ordered in general and thus we need to be more careful. For technical reasons, we make the following assumption on the marginals.

*Assumption* 4.1. $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \mu_2)$ is a centered peacock such that $\mu_1$ and $\mu_2$ are symmetric and equivalent to the Lebesgue measure.

4.1.1. *Main result.* For the first stopping time, we take the solution given by Vallois [33] that embeds $\mu_1$, *i.e.*,

$$\tau_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} := \inf\{t > 0 : |B_t| \geq \phi_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(L_t)\},$$

where $\phi_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is the inverse of $\psi_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ given by

$$\psi_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(x) := \int_0^x \frac{y\mu_1(y)}{\mu_1([y, +\infty))}\, dy, \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}_+. \tag{4.1}$$

For the second stopping time, we look for an increasing function $\phi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $B^{\tau_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}$ is uniformly integrable and $B_{\tau_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}} \sim \mu_2$, where

$$\tau_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} := \inf\{t \geq \tau_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \ : \ |B_t| \geq \phi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(L_t)\}.$$

As before, $\phi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ is defined through its inverse $\psi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$. First, we set

$$\psi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(x) = \int_0^x \frac{y\,\mu_2(y)}{\mu_2([y, +\infty))}\, dy, \quad \text{for all } x \in [0, x_1], \tag{4.2}$$

where $x_1$ is the smallest element such that the r.h.s. above exceeds $\psi_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$. To ensure that $x_1 > 0$, we need to assume that $\delta\mu := \mu_2 - \mu_1 \leq 0$ on a neighborhood of zero. If $x_1 = +\infty$, the construction is over. This corresponds to the case when the Vallois embeddings are well-ordered. Otherwise, we proceed by induction as follows:

(i) if $x_{2i-1} < +\infty$, we set for all $x \in (x_{2i-1}, x_{2i}]$,

$$\psi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(x) = \psi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(x_{2i-1}) + \int_{x_{2i-1}}^x \frac{y\,\delta\mu(y)}{\delta\mu([y, +\infty))} dy, \tag{4.3}$$

where $x_{2i}$ is the smallest element such that $\psi_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ exceeds the r.h.s. above;

(ii) if $x_{2i} < +\infty$, we set for all $x \in (x_{2i}, x_{2i+1}]$,

$$\psi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(x) = \psi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(x_{2i}) + \int_{x_{2i}}^x \frac{y\,\mu_2(y)}{\mu_2([y, +\infty))} dy, \tag{4.4}$$

where $x_{2i+1}$ is the smallest element such that the r.h.s. above exceeds $\psi_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$.

To ensure that $\psi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ is well-defined and increasing, we need to make the following assumption.

*Assumption* 4.2. (i) $\delta\mu \leq 0$ and $\delta\mu \not\equiv 0$ on a neighborhood of zero;
(ii) $\delta\mu > 0$ whenever $\psi_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} < \psi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$;
(iii) $x_i = +\infty$ for some $i \geq 1$.

**Theorem 4.3.** *Under Assumptions 4.1 and 4.2, if $\psi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ is given by* (4.3) *and* (4.4)*, then $B^{\tau_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}$ is uniformly integrable and $B_{\tau_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}} \sim \mu_2$.*

The proof of this result will be performed in the next section. Notice already that both points (i) and (ii) of Assumption 4.2 are to a certain extent necessary conditions to ensure the existence of an increasing function $\psi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ that solves the two-marginal SEP as above. See Remark 4.4 below for more details. This suggests that one needs to relax the monotonicity assumption on $\psi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ in order to iterate the Vallois embedding. However, our approach does not allow to compute the function $\psi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ in this general setting. Notice also that the point (iii) ensures that $\psi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ is well-defined and satisfies an appropriate condition of integrability. In view of the proof below, it is clear that our construction works in a more general setting.

4.1.2. *Proof of Theorem 4.3.* For the sake of clarity, we omit the index $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ in the notations and we split the proof in three steps.

*First step.* We start by showing that the distribution of $B_{\tau_2}$ admits a density w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure. We claim that $\psi_2$ is increasing and $\gamma_2(+\infty) = +\infty$, which is proved in Step 3 below. Notice first that the distribution of $B_{\tau_2}$ is symmetric by construction. By the strong Markov property and Lemma B.1, if we take the function $\lambda(y) = \mathbf{1}_{\{y \leq x\}}$ for some $x \geq 0$, it holds

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\lambda\left(|B_{\tau_2}|\right)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[f\left(B_{\tau_1}, L_{\tau_1}\right)\right] = \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{f\left(\phi_1(l), l\right)}{\phi_1(l)} e^{-\gamma_1(l)}\, dl,$$

where

$$f(x,l) = \begin{cases} -c'(l)|x| + c(l), & \text{if } |x| < \phi_2(l), \\ \lambda(|x|), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{with } c(l) := e^{\gamma_2(l)} \int_l^{+\infty} \frac{\lambda(\phi_2(m))}{\phi_2(m)} e^{-\gamma_2(m)} dm.$$

By a straightforward calculation, we get

$$c(l) = \left(1 - e^{\gamma_2(l) - \gamma_2 \circ \psi_2(x)}\right) \mathbf{1}_{\{l \leq \psi_2(x)\}},$$

and

$$\frac{f\left(\phi_1(l), l\right)}{\phi_1(l)} = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{1}{\phi_1(l)} + e^{\gamma_2(l) - \gamma_2 \circ \psi_2(x)} \left(\frac{1}{\phi_2(l)} - \frac{1}{\phi_1(l)}\right)\right) \mathbf{1}_{\{l \leq \psi_2(x)\}}, & \text{if } \phi_1(l) < \phi_2(l), \\ \frac{1}{\phi_1(l)} \mathbf{1}_{\{l \leq \psi_1(x)\}}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|B_{\tau_2}| \leq x\right) = \sum_{i \geq 0} \Bigg( e^{-\gamma_2 \circ \psi_2(x)} \int_{l_{2i}}^{l_{2i+1}} \mathbf{1}_{\{l \leq \psi_2(x)\}}\, d e^{\gamma_2(l) - \gamma_1(l)} \\ - \int_{l_{2i}}^{l_{2i+1}} \mathbf{1}_{\{l \leq \psi_2(x)\}}\, d e^{-\gamma_1(l)} - \int_{l_{2i+1}}^{l_{2i+2}} \mathbf{1}_{\{l \leq \psi_1(x)\}}\, d e^{-\gamma_1(l)} \Bigg).$$

where $l_i := \psi_1(x_i) = \psi_2(x_i)$. We deduce by direct differentiation of the identity above that the distribution of $B_{\tau_2}$ admits a density $\nu$ w.r.t. the Lebesgue measure given by

$$\nu(x) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{\psi_2'(x)}{x} S_{2i}(x) & \text{if } x \in (x_{2i}, x_{2i+1}], \\ \dfrac{\psi_1'(x)}{2x} e^{-\gamma_1 \circ \psi_1(x)} + \dfrac{\psi_2'(x)}{x} S_{2i+1}(x) & \text{if } x \in (x_{2i+1}, x_{2i+2}], \end{cases}$$

where

$$S_i(x) := \frac{e^{-\gamma_2 \circ \psi_2(x)}}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{i} (-1)^j e^{\gamma_2(l_j) - \gamma_1(l_j)}.$$

*Second step.* Let us show now that $\nu$ coincides with $\mu_2$. Notice first that the relation (4.1) yields

$$e^{-\gamma_1 \circ \psi_1(x)} \;=\; 2\mu_1([x, +\infty)), \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Using further the identities (4.3) and (4.4), it follows that

$$\nu(x) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{\mu_2(x)}{\mu_2([x, +\infty))} S_{2i}(x) & \text{if } x \in (x_{2i}, x_{2i+1}], \\ \mu_1(x) + \dfrac{\delta\mu(x)}{\delta\mu([x, +\infty))} S_{2i+1}(x) & \text{if } x \in (x_{2i+1}, x_{2i+2}]. \end{cases}$$

To conclude, it remains to show that $S_{2i}(x) = \mu_2([x, +\infty))$ for all $x \in (x_{2i}, x_{2i+1}]$ and $S_{2i+1}(x) = \delta\mu([x, +\infty))$ for all $x \in (x_{2i+1}, x_{2i+2}]$. For $i = 0$, it follows from the relation (4.2) that

$$S_0(x) = \frac{e^{-\gamma_2 \circ \psi_2(x)}}{2} = \mu_2([x, +\infty)), \quad \text{for all } x \in [0, x_1].$$

In addition, the point (i) of Assumption 4.1 ensures that

$$\delta\mu([x_1, +\infty)) = \frac{e^{-\gamma_2(l_1)} - e^{-\gamma_1(l_1)}}{2} > 0.$$

Assume that $S_{2i}(x) = \mu_2([x, +\infty))$ for all $x \in (x_{2i}, x_{2i+1}]$. It results from the relation (4.3) that

$$e^{-\gamma_2 \circ \psi_2(x) + \gamma_2(l_{2i+1})} = \frac{\delta\mu([x, +\infty))}{\delta\mu([x_{2i+1}, +\infty))}, \quad \text{for all } x \in (x_{2i+1}, x_{2i+2}].$$

Hence, we deduce that for all $x \in (x_{2i+1}, x_{2i+2}]$,

$$S_{2i+1}(x) = e^{-\gamma_2 \circ \psi_2(x) + \gamma_2(l_{2i+1})} \left( S_{2i}\left(x_{2i+1}\right) - e^{-\gamma_1(l_{2i+1})} \right) = \delta\mu([x, +\infty)).$$

In particular, it follows that $\delta\mu([x, +\infty)) > 0$ for all $x \in (x_{2i+1}, x_{2i+2}]$. Further, it results from the relation (4.4) that

$$e^{-\gamma_2 \circ \psi_2(x) + \gamma_2(l_{2i+2})} \;=\; \frac{\mu_2([x, +\infty))}{\mu_2([x_{2i+2}, +\infty))} \quad \text{for all } x \in (x_{2i+2}, x_{2i+3}].$$

Hence, we deduce that for all $x \in (x_{2i+2}, x_{2i+3}]$,

$$S_{2i+2}(x) = e^{-\gamma_2 \circ \psi_2(x) + \gamma_2(l_{2i+2})} \left( S_{2i+1}\left(x_{2i+2}\right) + e^{-\gamma_1(l_{2i+2})} \right) = \mu_2([x, +\infty)).$$

In addition, it holds

$$\delta\mu([x_{2i+3}, +\infty)) = S_{2i+2}(x_{2i+3}) - \frac{e^{-\gamma_1(l_{2i+3})}}{2} > 0.$$

*Third step.* We are now in a position to complete the proof. The relation (4.4) clearly imposes that $\psi_2$ is increasing on every interval such that $\psi_1 > \psi_2$. Under Assumption 4.2, the relation (4.3) ensures that $\psi_2$ is increasing on every interval such that $\psi_1 < \psi_2$ since

$$\delta\mu\left([x,+\infty)\right) > 0, \quad \text{for all } x \in [x_{2i+1}, x_{2i+2}].$$

In addition, one easily checks that $\gamma_2(+\infty) = +\infty$ in view of Assumption 4.1 (iii). It remains to prove that the stopped process $B^{\tau_2}$ is uniformly integrable. Since $|B_{t\wedge\tau_2}| \leq |B_{\tau_2}|$ for all $t \geq 0$ by construction, the uniform integrability follows immediately from the assumption that $\mu_2$ admits a finite first moment. □

*Remark* 4.4. The first step of the proof does not rely on the specific form of the function $\psi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$. More precisely, for any absolutely continuous and increasing function $\psi_2$, it ensures that the distribution of $B_{\tau_2}$ — where $\tau_2$ is defined as $\tau_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ with $\psi_2$ instead of $\psi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ — has a density $\nu$ w.r.t. the Lebebesgue measure given by

$$\nu(x) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{\psi_2'(x)}{x}\left(S(x) + e^{-\gamma_1\circ\psi_2(x)}\right) & \text{if } \psi_1 > \psi_2, \\ \mu_1(x) + \dfrac{\psi_2'(x)}{x}S(x) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where

$$S(x) := -e^{\gamma_2\circ\psi_2(x)} \int_{\{\phi_1<\phi_2\}} \mathbf{1}_{\{\phi_2(l)<x\}}\, de^{\gamma_2(l)-\gamma_1(l)}.$$

The relation above sheds new light on Assumption 4.2. For instance, if $\psi_1$ is below $\psi_2$ near zero, then we see that $\nu$ has to coincide with $\mu_1$ near zero. In particular, one cannot expect to solve the two-marginal SEP as above, if $\delta\mu \geq 0$ and $\delta\mu \not\equiv 0$ on a neighborhood of zero. In addition, since $S \geq 0$ by construction, we deduce that $\psi_2$ is increasing if and only if $\nu - \mu_1 > 0$ whenever $\psi_1 < \psi_2$.

4.1.3. *A numerical example.* As an example, we consider the symmetric densities $\mu_1$ and $\mu_2$ given by

$$\mu_1(x) \;:=\; e^{-2x} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_2(x) \;:=\; \begin{cases} \frac{5}{2}x^3 e^{-\frac{5x^4}{4}}, & \text{if } 0 \leq x \leq 1, \\ e^{-2x} + \delta\mu(1)x^{\gamma-2}e^{\frac{-\gamma(x^{\gamma-1}-1)}{\gamma-1}}, & \text{if } x > 1, \end{cases}$$

where $\gamma$ is a parameter satisfying $\delta\mu(1) = \gamma\delta\mu([1,+\infty))$. One can easily check by direct calculation that the marginals $\mu_1$ and $\mu_2$ are increasing in the convex order. The corresponding embedding maps $\psi_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $\psi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ are given by

$$\psi_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(x) = x^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(x) = \begin{cases} x^5, & \text{if } 0 \leq x \leq 1 \\ x^\gamma, & \text{if } x > 1. \end{cases}$$

All the assumptions in Theorem 4.3 are satisfied as can be seen in Figure 1.

In Figure 2, we provide a comparison of the analytical cumulative distributions of $B_{\tau_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}$ and $B_{\tau_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}$ with their Monte-Carlo estimations using $2^{17}$ paths. We find a very good match except on a neighborhood of zero. Note that the simulation of $\tau_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $\tau_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ are quite difficult as we need to simulate the local time of a Brownian motion, which is a highly irregular object. We have chosen to simulate the local time $L_{k\Delta t}$ at a time step $k\Delta t$ using

$$L_{k\Delta t} - L_{(k-1)\Delta t} \quad = \quad \frac{\Delta t}{2\epsilon}\mathbf{1}_{\{B_{(k-1)\Delta t}\in[-\epsilon,\epsilon]\}}$$

with $\epsilon = 0.04$ and $\Delta t = 1/4000$. Since the derivatives of $\phi_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $\phi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ are infinite at zero, the accuracy of our Monte Carlo estimations near zero depend strongly on the discretization of the local time, which explains the small mismatch in Figure 2.




FIGURE 1. Red: $\psi_1$. Green: $\psi_2$. Blue: $\delta\mu$.




FIGURE 2. MC cumulative distributions and analytical cumulative distributions.

4.2. **Robust superhedging problem.** In this section, we extend the stochastic control approach described in Section 3.3 to provide candidates for the optimal superhedging strategy in the two-marginal case. Although we are not able to verify the hedging inequality in the general case, we provide a couple of examples where we can complete the proof.

4.2.1. *Stochastic control approach.* Following the inspiration of Henry-Labordère, Oblój, Spoida and Touzi [18], we extend the stochastic control approach to the two-marginal setting. Using the notations of Section 3.3, we consider the following relaxed superhedging problem:

$$\bar{U}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} := \inf\left\{Y_0 : \exists\, (\Delta, \mathbf{H}) \in \overline{\mathcal{H}}_S \times (L^\infty)^2 \text{ such that } Y_T^{\Delta,\mathbf{H}} \geq F(L_T), \mathbb{P}-\text{a.s. for all } \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_S\right\}.$$

A dual formulation of this problem is given by

$$\bar{U}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = \inf_{\mathbf{H}\in(L^\infty)^2} \{u(0,0) + \mu_1(H_1) + \mu_2(H_2)\},$$

where $u : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$u(x,l) := \sup_{(\tau_1,\tau_2)\in\mathcal{T}_2} \mathbb{E}_{x,l}\left[F(L_{\tau_2}) - H_2(B_{\tau_2}) - H_1(B_{\tau_1})\right],$$

where $\mathcal{T}_2$ is the collection of ordered stopping times $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2 < +\infty$ such that $B^{\tau_2}$ is uniformly integrable.

Then we introduce the functions $u_0$, $u_1$ and $u_2$ as follows: $u_2(x,l) := F(l)$ and for $i = 0, 1$,

$$u_i(x,l) := \sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}} \mathbb{E}_{x,l}\left[u_{i+1}(B_\tau, L_\tau) - H_{i+1}(B_\tau)\right].$$

The dynamic programming principle induces formally $u_0 = u$. In addition, for $i = 0, 1$, each function $u_i$ should satisfy the HJB equation corresponding to an optimal stopping problem, that reads formally

$$\max\left(u_{i+1} - H_{i+1} - u_i, \frac{1}{2}\partial_{xx}u_i + \delta(x)\partial_l u_i\right) = 0. \tag{4.5}$$

We set $v_2 = u_2 = F$ and we look for a solution $v_i$ of the form

$$v_i(x,l) := \begin{cases} a_i(l)x^+ + b_i(l)x + c_i(l) & \text{if } (x,l) \in \mathcal{D}_{i+1}, \\ v_{i+1}(x,l) - H_{i+1}(x), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\mathcal{D}_{i+1} := \{(x,l) \ : \ |x| < \phi_{i+1}(l))\}$ and $\phi_{i+1} : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is an increasing function such that $\gamma_{i+1}(0+) = 0$ and $\gamma_{i+1}(+\infty) = +\infty$ where

$$\gamma_{i+1}(l) \ := \ \int_0^l \frac{1}{\phi_{i+1}(m)} dm, \quad \text{for all } l > 0.$$

For the sake of simplicity, we assume that all the functions are sufficiently smooth to allow the calculation sketched below. Using the arguments of Section 3.3, we deduce that

$$v_1(x,l) = H_2'(\phi_2(l)) \left(\phi_2(l) - |x|\right)^+ + F(l) - H_2(|x| \vee \phi_2(l)),$$

$$v_0(x,l) = H_1'(\phi_1(l)) \left(\phi_1(l) - |x|\right)^+ + H_2'(\bar{\phi}(l)) \left(\bar{\phi}(l) - |x|\right)^+ + F(l) - H_1(|x| \vee \phi_1(l)) - H_2(|x| \vee \bar{\phi}(l)),$$

where $\bar{\phi} := \phi_1 \vee \phi_2$. In addition, the maps $H_1$ and $H_2$ are even and satisfy

$$H_2' \circ \phi_2(l) = F'(l) + \phi_2(l)(H_2' \circ \phi_2)'(l), \tag{4.6}$$

$$H_1' \circ \phi_1(l) = \phi_1(l)(H_1' \circ \phi_1)'(l), \qquad \text{if } \phi_1(l) \le \phi_2(l), \tag{4.7}$$

$$(H_1 + H_2)' \circ \phi_1(l) = F'(l) + \phi_1(l)((H_1 + H_2)' \circ \phi_1)'(l), \qquad \text{if } \phi_1(l) > \phi_2(l). \tag{4.8}$$

It follows that

$$H_2'(\phi_2(l)) = e^{\gamma_2(l)} \int_l^{+\infty} \frac{F'(m)}{\phi_2(m)} e^{-\gamma_2(m)} dm. \tag{4.9}$$

Similarly, on each interval such that $\phi_1(l) < \phi_2(l)$, there exists a constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$H_1'(\phi_1(l)) = C e^{\gamma_1(l)} \tag{4.10}$$

and, on each interval such that $\phi_1(l) > \phi_2(l)$, there exists a constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(H_1 + H_2)'(\phi_1(l)) = e^{\gamma_1(l)} \left( \int_l^{+\infty} \frac{F'(m)}{\phi_1(m)} e^{-\gamma_1(m)} dm + C \right). \tag{4.11}$$

If we assume that $\phi_2 - \phi_1$ changes sign finitely many times, we can determine all the constants involved in the expression of $H_1'$ above by using the continuity of $H_1'$ at the intersection points of $\phi_1$ and $\phi_2$ and by imposing that $H_1'$ is bounded.

Provided that $F$ is convex, $H_2$ is also convex on $\mathbb{R}_+$ and $\mathbb{R}_-$ and one easily checks that $v_1$ solves the HJB equation (4.5) for $i = 1$. However, it is still an open problem to show that $v_0$ is actually a solution to the HJB equation (4.5) for $i = 0$. The issue is to prove that $v_0 \ge v_1 - H_1$.

4.2.2. *Semi-static superhedging strategy.* Under the assumption that $v_0 \ge v_1 - H_1$, we explain how to derive the pathwise inequality. Given the maturities $0 < t_1 < t_2 = T$, we can show by the arguments of Proposition A.1 that for all $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$

$$F(L_{t_2}) - H_2(X_{t_2}) \le \quad v_1(X_{t_2}, L_{t_2}) \quad \le v_1(X_{t_1}, L_{t_1}) + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \partial_x v_1 \left(X_u, L_u\right) dX_u, \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s.}$$

$$v_1(X_{t_1}, L_{t_1}) - H_1(X_{t_1}) \le \quad v_0(X_{t_1}, L_{t_1}) \quad \le \int_0^{t_1} \partial_x v_0 \left(X_u, L_u\right) dX_u, \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s.},$$

where $H_1$ and $H_2$ are given by (4.9), (4.10), (4.11) and $H_1(0) + H_2(0) = F(0)$. It yields the following pathwise inequality:

$$F(L_{t_2}) \le \int_0^{t_2} \Delta_u dX_u + H_1(X_{t_1}) + H_2(X_{t_2}), \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s. for all } \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}, \tag{4.12}$$

where

$$\Delta_u := \begin{cases} -\left(H_1'\left(\phi_1(L_u) \vee |X_u|\right) + H_2'\left(\bar{\phi}(L_u) \vee |X_u|\right)\right) \operatorname{sgn}(X_u), & \text{if } 0 \le u \le t_1, \\ -H_2'\left(\phi_2(L_u) \vee |X_u|\right) \operatorname{sgn}(X_u), & \text{if } t_1 < u \le t_2. \end{cases}$$

In other words, $(\Delta, \mathbf{H})$ is a semi-static superhedging strategy for the derivative of payoff $F(L_{t_2})$.

Assume further that $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ satisfies Assumptions 4.1 and 4.2, then we can construct the embedding functions $(\phi_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \phi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}})$ and the stopping times $(\tau_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \tau_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}})$ as in Section 4.1. Denote by $\mathbb{P}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \in \mathcal{P}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ the law of the process $(Z_t)_{0\le t\le T}$ given by

$$Z_t := \begin{cases} B_{\tau_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \wedge \frac{t}{t_1 - t}} & \text{if } 0 \le t \le t_1, \\ B_{\tau_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \wedge (\tau_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \vee \frac{t-t_1}{t_2 - t})}, & \text{if } t_1 < t \le t_2. \end{cases}$$

Following the arguments of Theorem 3.10, we deduce that there is no duality gap, *i.e.*,

$$P^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(F(L_T)) = U^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(F(L_T)) = \mu_1(H_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) + \mu_2(H_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}),$$

where $H_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $H_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ are constructed from $(\phi_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \phi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}})$. In addition, $\mathbb{P}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ is a maximizer for $P^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(F(L_T))$ such that

$$F(L_{t_2}) = \int_0^{t_2} \Delta_u^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} dX_u + H_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(X_{t_1}) + H_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(X_{t_2}), \quad \mathbb{P}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \text{a.s.},$$

where

$$\Delta_u^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} := \begin{cases} -\left(H_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}\prime}(\phi_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(L_u)) + H_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}\prime}\left(\bar{\phi}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(L_u)\right)\right) \operatorname{sgn}(X_u), & \text{if } 0 \le u \le t_1, \\ -H_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}\prime}(\phi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(L_u)) \operatorname{sgn}(X_u), & \text{if } t_1 < u \le t_2. \end{cases}$$

As a by-product, we see that our extension of the Vallois embedding maximizes the expectation of a convex function of the local time among all solutions to the two-marginal SEP.

*Example* 4.5. Assume that there exists $l^* > 0$ such that

$$\forall\, l \in [0, l^*], \quad \phi_1(l) \le \phi_2(l); \qquad \forall\, l \in (l^*, +\infty), \quad \phi_1(l) \ge \phi_2(l). \tag{4.13}$$

If $F''(l) = 0$ for all $l \ge l^*$, the pathwise inequality (4.12) reduces to

$$H_2(X_{t_2}) - \int_0^{t_1} H_2'\left(\bar{\phi}(L_u) \vee |X_u|\right) \operatorname{sgn}(X_u) dX_u \\ - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} H_2'\left(\phi_2(L_u) \vee |X_u|\right) \operatorname{sgn}(X_u) dX_u \ge F(L_{t_2}), \quad \mathbb{P} - \text{a.s. } \forall\, \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}.$$

where $H_2$ is given by (4.9) with $H_2(0) = F(0)$. This relation is now an easy consequence of Proposition A.1. Thus, if the maps $(\phi_1^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \phi_2^{\boldsymbol{\mu}})$ satisfy (4.13), there is no duality gap and the corresponding optimizers can be derived as above. We conclude that the information about the $t_1$–marginal does not tighten the bound in this setting.

4.2.3. *Application.* We follow the main idea described above in order to derive a remarkable estimation of the moments of the local time by the moments of the underlying process. To this end, we take

$$F(l) \;=\; l^p, \quad \phi_1(l) \;=\; a_1 l \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_2(l) \;=\; a_2 l,$$

with some fixed constant $p > 1$, $a_1 > 0$ and $a_2 > 0$. Notice that we are no longer in the setting of the previous sections because $\frac{1}{\phi_1}$ and $\frac{1}{\phi_2}$ are not locally integrable in zero. However, if we assume that $1 - (p-1)a_1 > 0$ and $1 - (p-1)a_2 > 0$, we can still define $H_1$ and $H_2$ through the relations (4.9), (4.10) and (4.11). We find

$$H_1(x) \;=\; c_1 |x|^p \quad \text{and} \quad H_2(x) \;=\; c_2 |x|^p,$$

where

$$c_1 \;=\; \mathbf{1}_{\{a_1 \ge a_2\}} \left( \frac{a_1^{1-p}}{1 - (p-1)a_1} - \frac{a_2^{1-p}}{1 - (p-1)a_2} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad c_2 \;=\; \frac{a_2^{1-p}}{1 - (p-1)a_2}.$$

**Proposition 4.6.** *With the notations above, if we assume further that either $c_1 \geq 0$, then the following pathwise inequality holds: for all $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$*

$$L_{t_2}^p \leq c_1|X_{t_1}|^p + c_2|X_{t_2}|^p - \int_0^{t_2} p\Big(\mathbf{1}_{\{s\leq t_1\}} c_1 a_1^{p-1} + c_2 a_2^{p-1}\Big) L_s^{p-1}\mathrm{sgn}(X_s)\, dX_s, \quad \mathbb{P}-a.s.$$

*Further, one has*

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[L_{t_2}^p] \leq c_1\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[|X_{t_1}|^p] + c_2\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[|X_{t_2}|^p]. \tag{4.14}$$

*Proof.* Let $v_0 : \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ and $v_1 : \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ be given by

$$\begin{aligned} v_1(x,l) &:= H_2'\big(\phi_2(l)\big)\big(\phi_2(l) - |x|\big) + F(l) - H_2\big(\phi_2(l)\big), \\ v_0(x,l) &:= \Big(H_1'\big(\phi_1(l)\big) - \partial_x v_1\big(\phi_1(l), l\big)\Big)\big(\phi_1(l) - |x|\big) + v_1\big(\phi_1(l), l\big) - H_1\big(\phi_1(l)\big). \end{aligned}$$

By the convexity of $H_1$ and $H_2$, it holds

$$v_0(x,l) \;\geq\; v_1(x,l) - H_1(x) \quad \text{and} \quad v_1(x,l) \;\geq\; F(l) - H_2(x).$$

Then the pathwise inequality follows by applying Itô-Tanaka's formula to $v_0(X_t, L_t)$ and $v_1(X_t, L_t) - v_1(X_{t_1}, L_{t_1})$ as in Proposition 3.4. Further, if we denote by $(\sigma_n)_{n\geq 1}$ a sequence of stopping times that reduces the stochastic integral $\int_0^{\cdot} L_s^{p-1}\mathrm{sgn}(X_s)\, dX_s$, then one has by Jensen's inequality

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[L_{t_2\wedge\sigma_n}^p] \;\leq\; c_1\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[|X_{t_1\wedge\sigma_n}|^p] + c_2\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[|X_{t_2\wedge\sigma_n}|^p] \;\leq\; c_1\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[|X_{t_1}|^p] + c_2\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[|X_{t_2}|^p],$$

which yields the inequality (4.14) by the monotone convergence theorem. □

The infimum in the r.h.s. of (4.14) over all pairs $(a_1, a_2)$ is attained for $a_1 = a_2 = \frac{1}{p}$, which yields the well-known inequality

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[L_{t_2}^p] \;\leq\; p^p\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[|X_{t_2}|^p],$$

see, *e.g.*, Vallois [34]. The proposition above has a clear financial interpretation in terms of robust superhedging of power options on the local time. It provides a robust super-replication strategy using Vanilla options with p-payoffs $H(x) = cx^p$. Since the minimal bound is achieved by holding only $t_2$-Vanilla options, it implies that the information about the intermediate marginal does not tighten the bound. However, if we impose further a liquidity constraints on $p$-payoffs, the optimal bound is given from Proposition 4.6 by

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[L_{t_2}^p] \quad\leq\quad \inf_{(a_1,a_2)\,|\,c_1\leq C_1, c_2\leq C_2} \big\{c_1\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[|X_{t_1}|^p] + c_2\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[|X_{t_2}|^p]\big\}.$$

where $C_1$ and $C_2$ are constants describing the liquidity constraints. This will lead to a semi-static strategy depending on both $t_1$-Vanillas and $t_2$-Vanillas.

## 5. A special multi-marginal case

In this section, we consider a special multi-marginal case when the stopping times given by Vallois are well-ordered. In the $n$-marginal case, we show that the robust hedging problem essentially reduces to the one-marginal case. Then we exhibit a remarkable Markov martingale under the assumption that all the marginals of the process are known.

5.1. **Robust hedging problem with $n$ marginals.** Given $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_i)_{1\le i\le n}$ a family of centered probability distributions without mass at zero, we denote by $\tau^{\mu_i}$ the stopping time and by $(\phi_+^{\mu_i}, \phi_-^{\mu_i})$ the pair of functions given by Vallois [33] that embed the probability distribution $\mu_i$.

*Assumption* 5.1. The map $i \mapsto \tau^{\mu_i}$ is increasing or, equivalently,

$$\phi_-^{\mu_j} \ \le\ \phi_-^{\mu_i} \ \le\ \phi_+^{\mu_i} \ \le\ \phi_+^{\mu_j} \quad \text{for all } 1 \le i \le j \le n.$$

The next theorem shows that the robust superhedging problem essentially reduces to the one-marginal case in this setting. The corresponding result for the robust subhedging problem is obvious.

**Theorem 5.2.** *Under Assumption 2.1 and 5.1, there is no duality gap, i.e.,*

$$P^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(F(L_T)) = U^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(F(L_T)) = \mu_T(H^{\mu_T}),$$

*where $H^{\mu_T}$ is constructed from* (3.1), (3.2) *and* (3.3) *with $(\phi_+^{\mu_T}, \phi_-^{\mu_T})$. In addition, there exists a maximizer $\mathbb{P}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ for $P^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(F(L_T))$ such that*

$$\int_0^T \Delta_s^{\mu_T} dX_s + H^{\mu_T}(X_T) = F(L_T), \quad \mathbb{P}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - a.s.,$$

*where the process $\Delta^{\mu_T}$ is given by* (3.5) *with $(\phi_+^{\mu_T}, \phi_-^{\mu_T})$.*

*Proof.* Denote by $\mathbb{P}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ the law of the process $Z$ given by

$$Z_t := B_{\tau^{\mu_i} \wedge (\tau^{\mu_{i-1}} \vee \frac{t-t_{i-1}}{t_i - t})}, \quad \forall\, t \in (t_{i-1}, t_i].$$

where $\tau^{\mu_0} = t_0 = 0$. Under Assumption 5.1, it is clear that $\mathbb{P}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ belongs to $\mathcal{P}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$. The rest of the proof is identical to the proof of Theorem 3.10. Indeed, since $X_T \in \{\phi_-^{\mu_T}(L_T), \phi_+^{\mu_T}(L_T)\}$ almost surely under $\mathbb{P}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$, it holds

$$\int_0^T \Delta_s^{\mu_T} dX_s + H^{\mu_T}(X_T) = F(L_T), \quad \mathbb{P}^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \text{a.s.}$$

Then we can complete the proof by Lemma 3.11. □

5.2. **A remarkable Markov martingale with full marginals.** In this section, we consider that all the marginals $(\mu_t)_{0\le t\le T}$ of the process are known. For the sake of simplicity, we assume that $\mu_t$ is symmetric and equivalent to the Lebesgue measure for every $t \in [0, T]$. Denote by $\tau_t$ the stopping time and by $\phi_t$ the function given by Vallois [33] that embed the probability distribution $\mu_t$.

*Assumption* 5.3. (i) for all $0 \le s \le t \le T$, $\tau_s \le \tau_t$, or equivalently, $\phi_s \le \ \phi_t$;
(ii) the map $(t, x) \mapsto \psi_t(x)$ admits first-order partial derivatives.

The next result gives the generator of the Markov process $(B_{\tau_t})_{0\le t\le T}$. It is analogous to the study of Madan and Yor [26, Sec.2.1] with the Azéma-Yor solution to the SEP. In particular, the process $(B_{\tau_t})_{0\le t\le T}$ is a pure jump process, which corresponds to an example of local Lévy model introduced in Carr, Geman, Madan and Yor [8].

**Theorem 5.4.** *Under Assumption 5.3, $(B_{\tau_t})_{0\le t\le T}$ is an inhomogeneous Markov martingale whose generator is given by*

$$\mathcal{L}_t f(x) \ = \ \frac{\partial_t \psi_t(|x|)}{\partial_x \psi_t(|x|)} \left( \frac{e^{\gamma_t \circ \psi_t(|x|)}}{2|x|} \int_{|x|}^{+\infty} (f(y) + f(-y) - 2f(x))\, de^{-\gamma_t \circ \psi_t(y)} - f'(x) \right),$$

*for all smooth bounded functions $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$.*

*Proof.* The process $(B_{\tau_t})_{0\le t\le T}$ is clearly an inhomogeneous Markov martingale, see [26] for more details. It remains to compute the generator. For each $0\le t<u\le T$, we denote

$$\mathbb{E}\big[f(B_{\tau_u})|B_{\tau_t}=x\big] \;=\; \mathbb{E}[f(B_{\tau_u})|B_{\tau_t}=x, L_{\tau_t}=\psi_t(|x|)] \quad =: \quad v\big(x,\psi_t(|x|)\big).$$

Then it follows from Lemma B.1 that

$$v\big(x,\psi_t(|x|)\big) \;=\; a_u\circ\psi_t(|x|)\,x^+ + b_u\circ\psi_t(|x|)\,x + c_u\circ\psi_t(|x|)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
a_u(l) &:= \frac{f\big(\phi_u(l)\big)+f\big(-\phi_u(l)\big)-2c_u(l)}{\phi_u(l)},\\
b_u(l) &:= \frac{c_u(l)-f\big(-\phi_u(l)\big)}{\phi_u(l)},\\
c_u(l) &:= e^{\gamma_u(l)}\int_l^{+\infty} e^{-\gamma_u(m)}\frac{f\big(\phi_u(m)\big)+f\big(-\phi_u(m)\big)}{2\phi_u(m)}dm.
\end{aligned}$$

By definition, the generator is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_t f(x) \;=\; \partial_t a_t\circ\psi_t(|x|)\,x^+ + \partial_t b_t\circ\psi_t(|x|)\,x + \partial_t c_t\circ\psi_t(|x|) \quad \text{for all } x\in\mathbb{R}.$$

A straightforward calculation yields that for all $x\ge 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t a_t\circ\psi_t(x)\,x &= -2\partial_t c_t\circ\psi_t(x) + \Big\{\frac{f(x)+f(-x)-2c_t\circ\psi_t(x)}{x} - f'(x)+f'(-x)\Big\}\frac{\partial_t\psi_t(x)}{\partial_x\psi_t(x)},\\
\partial_t b_t\circ\psi_t(x)\,x &= \partial_t c_t\circ\psi_t(x) + \Big\{\frac{c_t\circ\psi_t(x)-f(-x)}{x} - f'(-x)\Big\}\frac{\partial_t\psi_t(x)}{\partial_x\psi_t(x)}.
\end{aligned}$$

and for all $x<0$,

$$\partial_t b_t\circ\psi_t(-x)\,x \;=\; -\partial_t c_t\circ\psi_t(-x) + \Big\{\frac{c_t\circ\psi_t(-x)-f(x)}{x} - f'(x)\Big\}\frac{\partial_t\psi_t(-x)}{\partial_x\psi_t(-x)}.$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_t f(x) \;=\; \frac{\partial_t\psi_t(|x|)}{\partial_x\psi_t(|x|)}\left(\frac{f(x)-c_t\circ\psi_t(|x|)}{|x|} - f'(x)\right).$$

The desired result follows by the fact

$$\begin{aligned}
c_t\circ\psi_t(|x|) &= e^{\gamma_t\circ\psi_t(|x|)}\int_{|x|}^{+\infty} e^{-\gamma_t\circ\psi_t(y)}\frac{f(y)+f(-y)}{2y}\partial_x\psi_t(y)dy,\\
&= -\frac{e^{\gamma_t\circ\psi_t(|x|)}}{2}\int_{|x|}^{+\infty}\big(f(y)+f(-y)\big)de^{-\gamma_t\circ\psi_t(y)}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

As an application, we provide a new example of fake Brownian motion. If $(\mu_t)_{0\le t\le T}$ is a continuous Gaussian peacock, *i.e.*,

$$\mu_t(x)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi t}}e^{-\frac{x^2}{2t}}, \quad \text{for all } t\in[0,T] \text{ and } x\in\mathbb{R},$$

it satisfies Assumption 5.3 in view of Lemma 5.5 below. Then the process $(B_{\tau_t})_{0\le t\le T}$ is a fake Brownian motion, *i.e.*, a Markov martingale with the same marginal distributions as a Brownian motion that is not a Brownian motion.

**Lemma 5.5.** *If $(\mu_t)_{0\le t\le T}$ is a continuous Gaussian peacock, then the map $t\mapsto\psi_t(x)$ is decreasing for all $x>0$.*

*Proof.* For the sake of clarity, we denote $R_t(x) := \mu_t([x,+\infty))$ in this proof. By integration by parts, it holds for all $x \geq 0$,

$$\psi_t(x) = \int_0^x \frac{y\mu_t(y)}{R_t(y)}dy = \int_0^x \log\left(\frac{R_t(y)}{R_t(x)}\right)dy.$$

Further, by change of variable, we have $R_t(x) = R_1(\frac{x}{\sqrt{t}})$. To conclude, it is clearly enough to prove that the map $t \mapsto \frac{R_1(ty)}{R_1(tx)}$ is increasing for all $x > 0$ and $0 < y < x$. By direct differentiation, we see that its derivative has the same sign as

$$xe^{-\frac{t^2x^2}{2}}\int_{ty}^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{z^2}{2}}dz - ye^{-\frac{t^2y^2}{2}}\int_{tx}^{+\infty} e^{-\frac{z^2}{2}}dz \quad = \quad \int_{txy}^{+\infty}\left(e^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{z^2}{x^2}+t^2x^2\right)} - e^{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{z^2}{y^2}+t^2y^2\right)}\right)dz.$$

It remains to observe that the quantity above is positive since $\frac{z^2}{x^2}+t^2x^2 < \frac{z^2}{y^2}+t^2y^2$ for all $z > txy$, $0 < y < x$ and $x > 0$. □

## Appendix A. An alternative pathwise inequality

In the one-marginal case, the stochastic control approach induces naturally a pathwise inequality slighty different from the pathwise inequality of Proposition 3.4. The next proposition ensures that it is also valid.

**Proposition A.1.** *Under Assumptions 2.1 and 3.2, assume further that $\phi_\pm$ are strictly monotone, then the following inequality holds*

$$\int_0^T \Delta_u dX_u + H(X_T) \quad \geq \quad F(L_T),\ \mathbb{P}-a.s.\ for\ all\ \mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P},$$

*where the function $H$ is defined by* (3.1), (3.2), (3.3) *and the process $\Delta$ is given by*

$$\Delta_u \quad := \quad -H'(X_u \vee \phi_+(L_u))\mathbf{1}_{\{X_u>0\}} - H'(X_u \wedge \phi_-(L_u))\mathbf{1}_{\{X_u\leq 0\}}. \tag{A.1}$$

*Proof.* Consider the function $v : \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$v(x,l) \quad := \quad \begin{cases} u(x,l), & \text{if } x \in (\phi_-(l),\phi_+(l)),\\ F(l)-H(x), & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

where $u(x,l)$ was defined in the proof of Proposition 3.4. Since we have $v(x,l) \geq F(l) - H(x)$, it suffices to show that

$$v\left(X_T, L_T\right) \quad \leq \quad \int_0^T \Delta_u dX_u.$$

First, we notice that $v(x,\cdot)$ is absolutely continuous and its (right-continuous) derivative is given by

$$\partial_l v(x,l) \quad = \quad \begin{cases} e^{\gamma(l)}\int_l^{+\infty} e^{-\gamma(m)}F''(dm)\left(-\frac{x^+}{\phi_+(l)}+\frac{x^-}{\phi_-(l)}+1\right)+F'(l), & \text{if } x\in(\phi_-(l),\phi_+(l)),\\ F'(l), & \text{otherwise,}\end{cases}$$

and $v(\cdot,l)$ has a left derivative given by

$$\partial_x v(x,l) \quad = \quad \begin{cases} -H'(\phi_+(l))\mathbf{1}_{\{x>0\}} + H'(\phi_-(l))\mathbf{1}_{\{x\leq 0\}}, & \text{if } x\in(\phi_-(l),\phi_+(l)),\\ H'(x), & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

We are going to apply Itô's formula to a smooth approximation of $v$ in order to recover the desired result at the limit. This idea is very similar to the proof of Itô-Tanaka's formula in Karatzas and Shreve [23]. Let us define the smooth function $\rho$ as follows:

$$\rho(x) \quad = \quad C \exp\left(\frac{1}{(x-1)^2-1}\right)\mathbf{1}_{\{0<x<2\}},$$

where $C$ is the appropriate constant such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho(x)dx = 1$. Using the mollifiers $(\rho_n)_{n\geq 1}$ given by $\rho_n(x) := n\rho(nx)$, we construct the smooth approximations of $v$ by convolution:

$$v_{n,k}(x,l) \ := \ \int_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}_+} \rho_n(x-y)\rho_k(m-l)v(y,m)\,dy\,dm \ = \ \int_{[0,2]^2} \rho(y)\rho(m)v(x-\frac{y}{n},l+\frac{m}{k})\,dy\,dm.$$

Notice that $v_{n,k}$, $\partial_x v_{n,k}$ and $\partial_l v_{n,k}$ converge pointwise to $v$, $\partial_x v$ and $\partial_l v$ respectively. Now Itô's formula yields

$$\begin{aligned} v_{n,k}\left(X_T, L_T\right) - v_{n,k}(0,0) \ &= \ \int_0^T \partial_x v_{n,k}\left(X_s, L_s\right)\, dX_s \\ &\qquad + \int_0^T \partial_l v_{n,k}\left(0, L_s\right)\, dL_s + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T \partial_{xx} v_{n,k}\left(X_s, L_s\right)\, d\langle X\rangle_s. \end{aligned}$$

Sending $n$ and $k$ to infinity, we deduce that

$$\lim_{n,k\to\infty} \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T \partial_{xx} v_{n,k}\left(X_s, L_s\right)\, d\langle X\rangle_s \quad = \quad v\left(X_T, L_T\right) - \int_0^T \Delta_s\, dX_s - \int_0^T \partial_l v\left(0, L_s\right)\, dL_s,$$

in the sense of convergence in probability. In addition, we have by the convexity of $H$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \partial_{xx}\rho_n(x-y)v(y,l)dy \ = \ \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_n(x-y)\partial_{xx}v(dy,l) \ \leq \ -\left(H'(\phi_+(l)) - H'(\phi_-(l))\right)\rho_n(x).$$

where $\partial_{xx}v(\cdot,l)$ denotes the second derivative of $v(\cdot,l)$ in the sense of distributions. Using Lemma A.2 below, we derive

$$\lim_{n,k\to\infty} \int_0^T \partial_{xx} v_{n,k}\left(X_s, L_s\right)\, d\langle X\rangle_s \quad \leq \quad \int_0^T \left(H'(\phi_+(L_s)) - H'(\phi_-(L_s))\right)\, dL_s.$$

Hence, we obtain

$$v\left(X_T, L_T\right) \quad \leq \quad \int_0^T \Delta_s\, dX_s + \int_0^T \left(\partial_l v\left(0, L_s\right) - \frac{1}{2}\left(H'(\phi_+(L_s)) - H'(\phi_-(L_s))\right)\right)\, dL_s.$$

The conclusion follows immediately by using the identity (3.7). □

**Lemma A.2.** *With the notations of the proof of Proposition A.1, if $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ is absolutely continuous, then it holds for any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$,*

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \int_0^T f\left(L_u\right) \rho_n(X_u)\, d\langle X\rangle_u \quad = \quad \int_0^T f\left(L_u\right)\, dL_u, \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

*Proof.* By integration by parts, we have

$$\int_0^T f\left(L_u\right) \rho_n(X_u)\, d\langle X\rangle_u \quad = \quad f(L_T)\int_0^T \rho_n(X_u)\, d\langle X\rangle_u - \int_0^T f'\left(L_u\right)\int_0^u \rho_n(X_s)\, d\langle X\rangle_s\, dL_u.$$

Further, the occupation time formula yields

$$\int_0^u \rho_n(X_s)\, d\langle X\rangle_s \quad = \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \rho_n(x) L_u(x)\, dx, \quad \text{for all } u \geq 0,$$

where $(L_u(x))_{u\geq 0}$ denotes the local time of $X$ at $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $X$ is a martingale, there exists a version of the local time making the map $(u,x) \mapsto L_u(x)$ continuous, see, *e.g.*, Revuz and Yor [32, Thm.VI.1.7]. Hence, we obtain

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \int_0^u \rho_n(X_s)\, d\langle X\rangle_s \quad = \quad L_u, \quad \text{for all } u \geq 0.$$

By the dominated convergence theorem, we further deduce that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_0^T f\left(L_u\right) \rho_n(X_u)\, d\langle X\rangle_u \quad = \quad f(L_T)L_T - \int_0^T f'\left(L_u\right) L_u\, dL_u.$$

The conclusion follows by integration by parts. □

## Appendix B. A useful technical lemma

The lemma below gives a characterization of the distribution of $(B_\tau, L_\tau)$ where

$$\tau := \inf\left\{t > 0 : B_t \notin \left(\phi_-(L_t), \phi_+(L_t)\right)\right\}.$$

It is a key step in the proofs of Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 5.4.

**Lemma B.1.** *Under Assumption 3.2, for all $f : \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $l \mapsto f(\phi_\pm(l), l)$ is a function of bounded variation, it holds*

$$\mathbb{E}_{x,l}[f(B_\tau, L_\tau)] \quad = \quad \begin{cases} \frac{f(\phi_+(l),l)-c(l)}{\phi_+(l)} x^+ - \frac{f(\phi_-(l),l)-c(l)}{\phi_-(l)} x^- + c(l), & \text{if } x \in (\phi_-(l), \phi_+(l)) \\ f(x,l), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

*where $\mathbb{E}_{x,l}$ denotes the conditional expectation operator $\mathbb{E}\left[\cdot | B_0 = x, L_0 = l\right]$ and*

$$c(l) \quad = \quad \frac{1}{2}\int_l^{+\infty} \left(\frac{f(\phi_+(m),m)}{\phi_+(m)} - \frac{f(\phi_-(m),m)}{\phi_-(m)}\right) e^{\gamma(l)-\gamma(m)} dm \quad \text{for all } l \geq 0.$$

*Proof.* Let $(M_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be the process given by

$$M_t \;=\; \frac{f\left(\phi_+(L_t), L_t\right) - c(L_t)}{\phi_+(L_t)} B_t^+ - \frac{f\left(\phi_-(L_t), L_t\right) - c(L_t)}{\phi_-(L_t)} B_t^- + c(L_t).$$

By applying Itô-Tanaka's formula, we deduce that

$$M_t \;=\; M_0 + \int_0^t \left(\frac{f\left(\phi_+(L_s), L_s\right) - c(L_s)}{\phi_+(L_s)} \mathbf{1}_{\{B_s>0\}} - \frac{f\left(\phi_-(L_s), L_s\right) - c(L_s)}{\phi_-(L_s)} \mathbf{1}_{\{B_s\leq 0\}}\right) dB_s.$$

Hence, the process $M$ is a local martingale. Further, the stopped process $M^\tau$ is bounded by $5\|f\|_\infty$ since $\|c\|_\infty \leq \|f\|_\infty$ and $|B^\pm_{\tau\wedge t}| \leq \phi_\pm(L_{\tau\wedge t})$. It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}_{x,l}\left[M_\tau\right] \;=\; M_0 \;=\; \frac{f\left(\phi_+(l), l\right) - c(l)}{\phi_+(l)} x^+ - \frac{f\left(\phi_-(l), l\right) - c(l)}{\phi_-(l)} x^- + c(l).$$

To conclude, it remains to see that $M_\tau = f(B_\tau, L_\tau)$ by definition. □

## References


[1] M. Avellaneda, A. Levy, and A. Parás. Pricing and hedging derivative securities in markets with uncertain volatilities. *Applied Mathematical Finance*, 2(2):73–88, 1995.

[2] M. Beiglböck, P. Henry-Labordère, and F. Penkner. Model-independent bounds for option prices—a mass transport approach. *Finance Stoch.*, 17(3):477–501, 2013.

[3] M. Beiglboeck, A. M. G. Cox, and M. Huesmann. Optimal Transport and Skorokhod Embedding. *ArXiv e-prints*, July 2013.

[4] D. T. Breeden and R. H. Litzenberger. Prices of State-contingent Claims Implicit in Option Prices. *The Journal of Business*, 51(4):621–51, 1978.

[5] H. Brown, D. Hobson, and L. C. G. Rogers. The maximum maximum of a martingale constrained by an intermediate law. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 119(4):558–578, 2001.
[6] H. Brown, D. Hobson, and L. C. G. Rogers. Robust hedging of barrier options. *Math. Finance*, 11(3):285–314, 2001.
[7] P. Carr. Options on maxima, drawdown, trading gains, and local time. 2006.
[8] P. Carr, H. Geman, D. B. Madan, and M. Yor. From local volatility to local Lévy models. *Quant. Finance*, 4(5):581–588, 2004.
[9] P. Carr and R. Lee. From hyper options to options on local time. 2006.
[10] A. M. G. Cox, D. Hobson, and J. Oblój. Pathwise inequalities for local time: applications to Skorokhod embeddings and optimal stopping. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 18(5):1870–1896, 2008.
[11] A. M. G. Cox and J. Oblój. Robust pricing and hedging of double no-touch options. *Finance Stoch.*, 15(3):573–605, 2011.
[12] A. M. G. Cox and J. Wang. Root's barrier: construction, optimality and applications to variance options. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 23(3):859–894, 2013.
[13] L. Denis and C. Martini. A theoretical framework for the pricing of contingent claims in the presence of model uncertainty. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 16(2):827–852, 2006.
[14] Y. Dolinsky and H. M. Soner. Martingale optimal transport and robust hedging in continuous time. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 160(1-2):391–427, 2014.
[15] A. Galichon, P. Henry-Labordère, and N. Touzi. A stochastic control approach to no-arbitrage bounds given marginals, with an application to lookback options. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 24(1):312–336, 2014.
[16] G. Guo, X. Tan, and N. Touzi. Optimal Skorokhod embedding under finitely-many marginal constraints. *ArXiv e-prints*, 2015.
[17] G. Guo, X. Tan, and N. Touzi. Tightness and duality of martingale transport on the Skorokhod space. *ArXiv e-prints*, 2015.
[18] P. Henry-Labordere, J. Oblój, P. Spoida, and N. Touzi. The maximum maximum of a martingale with given n marginals. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 2015.
[19] D. Hobson. The skorokhod embedding problem and model-independent bounds for option prices. In *Paris-Princeton Lectures on Mathematical Finance 2010*, volume 2003 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, pages 267–318. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011.
[20] D. Hobson and A. Neuberger. Robust bounds for forward start options. *Math. Finance*, 22(1):31–56, 2012.
[21] D. G. Hobson. Robust hedging of the lookback option. *Finance and Stochastics*, 2(4):329–347, 1998.
[22] Z. Hou and J. Oblój. On robust pricing-hedging duality in continuous time. *ArXiv e-prints*, 2015.
[23] I. Karatzas and S. E. Shreve. *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, volume 113 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1991.
[24] H. G. Kellerer. Markov-Komposition und eine Anwendung auf Martingale. *Math. Ann.*, 198:99–122, 1972.
[25] T. J. Lyons. Uncertain volatility and the risk-free synthesis of derivatives. *Applied Mathematical Finance*, 2(2):117–133, 1995.
[26] D. B. Madan and M. Yor. Making Markov martingales meet marginals: with explicit constructions. *Bernoulli*, 8(4):509–536, 2002.
[27] M. Nutz. Pathwise construction of stochastic integrals. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 17:no. 24, 7, 2012.
[28] J. Oblój and P. Spoida. An Iterated Az\'{e}ma-Yor Type Embedding for Finitely Many Marginals. *ArXiv e-prints*, 2013.
[29] J. Oblój. The skorokhod embedding problem and its offspring. *Probab. Surveys*, 1:321–392, 2004.
[30] D. L. Ocone. A symmetry characterization of conditionally independent increment martingales. In *Barcelona Seminar on Stochastic Analysis (St. Feliu de Guíxols, 1991)*, volume 32 of *Progr. Probab.*, pages 147–167. Birkhäuser, Basel, 1993.
[31] D. Possamaï, G. Royer, and N. Touzi. On the robust superhedging of measurable claims. *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 18:no. 95, 13, 2013.
[32] D. Revuz and M. Yor. *Continuous martingales and Brownian motion*, volume 293 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, third edition, 1999.
[33] P. Vallois. Le problème de Skorokhod sur $\mathbf{R}$: une approche avec le temps local. In *Seminar on probability, XVII*, volume 986 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 227–239. Springer, Berlin, 1983.
[34] P. Vallois. Quelques inégalités avec le temps local en zero du mouvement brownien. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 41(1):117–155, 1992.

*E-mail address*: claisse@cmap.polytechnique.fr, guo@cmap.polytechnique.fr, pierre.henry-labordere@sgcib.com